Illinois U Library

SPEECH ACTIVITIES

Vol. IX SUMMER, 1953 No. 2

NATIONAL PUBLIC DISCUSSION WINNERS
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE, EAU CLAIR

EDUCATION *plus* PUBLIC DISCUSSION *equals* DEMOCRACY

$ FOR HIGH SCHOOL SPEAKERS $

Speech Activities

OFFERS THREE AWARDS

TOTALLING ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS

First award—$50.00

Second award—$30.00

Third award—$20.00

For the best written speech by a high school speaker summarizing his understanding of the problem involved in the debate proposition for the spring term, 1953—Resolved: that the Atlantic Pact nations should form a federal union. To come within the rules of the contest the student should not submit either a pro or a con argument, but a speech of not more than 1200 words which reflects his analysis of the problem and his attitude toward solving it.

Entries should be submitted to the Managing Editor of SPEECH ACTIVITIES between May 1 and June 1, 1953. All entries should be accompanied by an application blank signed by both the student and his instructor. Application blanks and complete rules for the contest will be provided in the summer issue of SPEECH ACTIVITIES which will be available early in May.

Rules for High School Contest

1. Each student should submit a written speech in which he analyzes the national, high school, debate proposition for the spring term, 1953, Resolved; that the Atlantic Pact Nations should form a federal union.
2. The student's speech should not be a straight pro or con presentation, but rather an analysis of the problem contained in this proposition with a consideration of what he thinks the solution might be.
3. All manuscripts should be typed on white paper, $8\frac{1}{2}$ x 11 inches.
4. The student's name should not appear upon the manuscript.
5. All manuscripts must be accompanied by an entry blank properly filled out and signed.
6. SPEECH ACTIVITIES takes no responsibility beyond reasonable care for manuscripts submitted and will not return them.
7. No manuscript may exceed 1200 words in length.
8. All contestants must be bona fide students in a secondary school within the United States or its territories.
9. The manuscript submitted by each student must be entirely his own work.
10. Judges will be appointed by the editors of SPEECH ACTIVITIES and will consist of speech instructors or forensic directors on the college level.
11. In all cases the decision of the judges will be final.
12. SPEECH ACTIVITIES reserves the right to make no award, if, in the opinion of the judges, none of the manuscripts merit an award.
13. SPEECH ACTIVITIES will not carry on correspondence regarding any manuscript submitted other than to provide entry blanks, or to announce disposition of the awards.
14. Manuscripts will be accepted by SPEECH ACTIVITIES beginning May 1, 1953, but not after June 1, 1953.
15. First award: $50.00; 2nd award: $30.00; third award: $20.00.
16. Decisions of the judges will be announced in the fall issue of SPEECH ACTIVITIES.

Staff of Speech Activities

Owner and Publisher: The Nichols Publishing House

Editor-in-Chief: EGBERT RAY NICHOLS

Associate Editor: E. RAY NICHOLS, JR.

COUNCIL OF ADVISORY EDITORS

EDITORS OF THE HONOR SOCIETY MAGAZINES

DEPARTMENTAL EDITORS

Hugo E. Hellman, Marquette University, Milwaukee Wisconsin.

Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois, Chicago Division, Navy Pier, Chicago, Ill.

E. Ray Nichols, Jr., Whittier College.

Malcolm Sillars, Iowa State, Ames.

Hale Aarnes, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.

BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICE

Speech Activities is published at 11103 East Rincon Drive, Whittier, Calif. Subscription price $4.00 a year, copies $1.50 each. For advertising rates write to the above address. All communications concerning subscriptions, change of address, and editorial matters should be addressed to the Editor, Egbert Ray Nichols, 11103 E. Rincon Drive, Whittier, Calif. Manuscripts and contributions welcomed.

BOARD OF CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Bruno E. Jacob, Secretary, National Forensic League, Ripon, Wisconsin.

A. Craig Baird, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

H. L. Ewbank, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis

Carroll P. Lahman, Pasadena College, Pasadena, Calif.

Richard C. Reager, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Brooks Quimby, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

James N. Holm, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

Howard L. Runion, College of Pacific, Stockton, Calif.

Dallas C. Dickey, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Forrest H. .Rose, S. E. Missouri State Teachers' College, Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana.

J. Edmund Mayer, Alhambra High School, Alhambra, California.

Brother Alexander, Sacred Heart High School, San Francisco, California.

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Page

A Speech History of Albion College — Carroll P. Lahman, G. Robert Anderson, and Robert Weiss 27

But is it Educational? — Brooks Quimby 30

Some Potentialities of Mathematical Philosophy in Discussion — Elton S. Carter 32

The Panel of Americans: An Experiment in Human Relationships — Dominic A. LaRusso 34

Leadership in Contest Discussion — Laura Crowell 36

FEATURES

The Editor in Japan 3

High School Questions for 1953-54 3

National Forensic League Finals 2

The Winning Discussion 3

Tournament Results 4

Cover, see Page 3

SPEECH ACTIVITIES

Formerly Debater's Magazine

SUMMER, 1953

Copyright 1952 by

THE NICHOLS PUBLISHING HOUSE

VOLUME IX No. 2

A Speech History of Albion College

Carroll P. Lahman, G. Robert Anderson, and Robert Weiss

Reprinted with permission of MICHIGAN HISTORY

It is a trusim that the small liberal arts college has exerted a disproportionately strong influence in American affairs. If speech is significant in the educational picture, it would seem worth while to discover and record the history of speech work in these institutions, as well as in universities and specialized schools. Such historical study offers challenging prospects for research.

The brief treatment here of eighty years at one such midwestern college in which there has always been an active speech program is based on upperclass undergraduate studies prepared for three seminar and honors papers.

Albion College, located midway across the state in southern Michigan, was chartered as an academy in 1835. The first college class was graduated in 1864. With the official backing of the Methodist church in 1870 the institution was firmly established, and college students increasingly supplanted those in the preparatory department.

The present study covers the three-quarters of a century since 1870. In general it discloses the same developmental history as as has been found elsewhere: rhetoricals under faculty direction, literary societies, organized class work in the curriculum, competitive activity in various forms of forensics within the college and with other institutions, and the growth of interest in dramatics.

The system of rhetoricals was rather complicated and, as one reads the college catalogs and student newspapers of the first twenty-five years, frequently changing. Integral parts of the system were rhetoricals as such, exhibitions, chapel orations, and a certain amount of instruction in elocution designed, at least in part, to prepare students for public performance.

The college catalog for 1871 reads:

> In addition to the ordinary recitations in rhetoric and rhetorical exercises, much time will be given by the freshman and sophomore classes to practical exercises in elocution and English composition, in which, by the aid of lectures, regular and systematic drill for the cultivation of the voice and gesture, and the frequent use of the pen, it is hoped that many of the students will become accomplished writers and speakers.

The drill in elementary exercises will be continued during the junior and senior years, and each member of these classes will deliver an original essay or oration, or participate in an original discussion (apparently a two-member debate), every four weeks before all the students.

When it came to public rhetoricals various members of the faculty lent a hand. In two instances instructors in mathematics and natural science are indicated as being in charge.

These exercises, consisting of the presentation of essays, declamations, and orations, flourished in the decade of the 1870's but went into a decline with the introduction of the elective system in 1882 and, despite various changes from time to time, were abolished by faculty action in 1900, when a three hour course in oratory for all students took their place.

In the general system of rhetoricals the class exhibitions attracted the most public attention. They antedated the beginning of this study in both the college and the academy. Each class usually had at least one exhibition during the

year, in which every member of the class was required to participate. At the end of the year there were commencement exercises for the seniors, whose original orations constituted the commencement program, and anniversary exercises put on by each of the literary societies.

In the class exhibitions sophomores and juniors were ordinarily required to present original orations or essays, but the freshman elocutionary exercises took the nature of interpretative reading or declamation in which almost any memorized selection could be given. These rules were not fixed, however, and sometimes freshmen were allowed or required to give original essays.

Among freshmen recitations Mrs. Elizabeth Browning almost always found a place in the programs, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and Alfred Tennyson were popular. The speeches of Patrick Henry and Daniel Webster were given frequently, as well as essays and orations culled from lesser known authors. Music was always an important part of these programs, for the speaking shared the spotlight with numbers by a glee club or orchestra and solos by talented students.

Most of the orations in class exhibitions seem to have been expository in style and only indirectly motivative. One approach that was popular was to make analogies between natural phenomena and religious or moral situations. The subject matter, undoubtedly influenced by the classical curriculum, was primarily of a religious, philosophical, or classical nature. Current events did not seem to affect the orations until the 1880's, when a broader scope of subjects was developed. It was in the eighties, also, that biographical orations began to appear.

In both junior and sophomore exhibitions the women sometimes prepared essays, which they read, rather than orations.

The school calendar in the college catalogs, which had formerly listed all the class exhibiitions, gave only the junior exhibition in 1880 and none at all after 1886. They continued to be held for many years but were never again so vital a part of the college program.

A final type of exhibition was the anniversary exercises presented by each of the literary societies, which constituted an important part of of commencement week. For these annual affairs three orators and three essayists were elected by the societies. These exhibitions were an important part of the college picture for many years, until the societies which sponsored them gradually faded out.

It is interesting to note that undergraduate oratory still has a place in 1951 in commencement week activities in the form of the Senior Horn Contest, in which one representative of each of the four college classes compete for a $20 prize established by the class of 1877 and for the privilege of having the winner's name engraved on a six-foot horn that was once a trophy in class scraps.

Unlike many other colleges, Albion's literary societies were largely coeducational. The Erosophian Society had been formed by the combination of a men's and a women's society in the 1860's. The Eclectic and Atheniaedes were brother and sister societies and merged in 1880. These two societies held their meetings on Friday evenings in spacious and well furnished rooms on the the third floor of North Hall. Each society had a suite of two rooms—the society hall and a reception or library room.

According to the testimany of those who attended, these societies gave their members a pleasant weekly social function as well as worthwhile practice in meeting varied speech situations, and all student, rather than faculty, directed. The literary societies during the zenith of their influence were not social gatherings that just happened to offer to their members speaking opportunities; they were organizations dedicated to the purpose of giving speech training. The preamble to the constitution of the Eclectic and Atheniaedes Society read:

> We, the undersigned, students of Albion College, for the purpose of securing more complete intellectual culture and improvement in Forensic and parliamentary usages, do hereby organize ourselves into a literary association.

With this declared purpose, it is little wonder that these organizations fostered programs that offered about every known type of speech activity, including interpretations of both original and published poems, the reading of essays, the rendering of declamations, the giving of orations, the order of business usually followed this general pattern: a musical selection, devotionals of some type, roll call of members, recitations, essays, orations, or a debate, toasts, and finally a business session from which visitors were barred. Often the program was built around a special theme such as some author.

Sometimes the whole program was discarded to hear an outside lecturer, and sometimes special events as a mock trial or a mock senate were held. In the election year of 1892 both societies held mock Republican and Democratic conventions.

Debates both within the societies and on an intersociety basis were very popular. Teams were made up of two speakers, usually a man and a woman, one the "chief disputant" and the other the "colleague". Today's convential order of speaking prevailed, except that only the chief disputant appeared in rebuttal.

Both philosophical and practical questions were debated, with the balance swinging to the latter as time went on. Two-member debates, or so-called discussions, were also held on about the same type of questions. Manuscripts were sometimes allowed in these debates, but their use was frowned upon. At times a symposium was held, in which several orators and essayists gave their presentations on different sides of a question or theme, but there was no direct clash.

Judges for the debates numbered three. They were usually faculty guests of the evening; sometimes they were qualified outsiders.

In addition to regular meetings the societies sponsored annual prize contests in recitations, essays, and orations, often with separate prizes for men and women.

More ambitiously, it was the societies who first ventured in intercollegiate oratory. In 1875 the Eclectic Society formed an association with societies from several other colleges in the state for the purpose of holding oratorical contests. Although the organization had only brief existence, antedating by twenty years, as it did, a true intercollegiate organization in the state, a contest was held at Albion on February 11, 1876, with two representatives present from societies representing Hillsdale, Olivet, Kalamazoo and Albion colleges.

The heyday of the literary societies at Albion seems to have been around 1890. From this time forward their power and influence in campus life dimished. The news ac-

counts of their functions show more and more emphasis on social activities and less on their dedicated purpose of "intellectual culture and improvement in Forensic and parliamentary usages." This does not mean that the literary societies immediately dropped out of sight. As a matter of fact, the number actually increased as they became more social until in 1915 seven such groups were listed in the college year book. Their final death knell was sounded in 1927, however, when the last one in existence became the local chapter of a national fraternity.

In one more college the literary society had succombed to the hurrying forces of a less leisurely age where young men and women belong to social fraternities and buy their recreation at the ticket window.

The eariest antecedent of a separate department of speech was a short-lived experiment with an over-ambitious department of oratory that hoped to develop into a separate school. The work was begun in 1888 by Mark Beal, a graduate of the Boston School of Oratory, enjoyed a phenomenal growth under his leadership as an exponent of modified Delsarte principles, and as quickly subsided when he left in 1892.

During the next decade five different instructors at different times taught expression, elocution, or oratory.

In the fall of 1903, however, there came to Albion a man who was to revolutionize speech teaching and speech activities at the college and, to a lesser extent, as his influence grew, throughout the country. That man was Charles Henry Woolbert.

Graduated from Northwestern University in 1900, he came to Albion College in 1903 as head of the English department, with the official title of professor of English and oratory. He taught courses in both fields. One of his four speech courses was called seminar in public speaking and gave one or two hours credit for participation in intercollegiate oratory and debate.

This giving of academic credit for deserving extracurricular speech work, later expanded to include discussion, dramatics, and interpretative reading has been a consistent policy at Albion and helps to explain the established position of these activities.

The annual presentation of a Shakespearean play, without scenery and costumes, by Woolbert's interpretation class became a tradition. His reputation for stimulating teaching, exacting standards, and severe criticism grew with the years. He represented a sharp break with the Delsarte school of expression and emphasized instead the psychological approach and the conversational mode.

In another way Woolbert at this period represented a very different approach from that advocated by many speech teachers today. He put extracurricular activities at the very center of his interest and effort.

Intercollegiate oratory, aside from the one meeting of representatives from theliterary societies of four colleges in 1876, had begun at Albion in 1893, when her representative won the state contest of the Intercollegiate Prohibition Association. In the spring of 1897, at the call of Fred Ingraham of Michigan State Normal School and Aquilla Webb of Albion, a meeting was held to organize the Michigan Intercollegiate Oratorical Association, which in revised and broadened form, is still active.

Into the selection and training of representatives for these and other contests, such as those on peace, Woolbert threw himself with enthusiasm. In 1911 Stanley Howe, a senior of that year, won both state and national peace oratorical contests. In 1912 Leroy Robinson, also a senior, won first-place state and interstate honors in regular oratory. During Woolbert's ten years of coaching, Albion men only once failed to place among the first three winners in the state contest of the Michigan Intercollegiate Oratorical Association, and five times they stood first.

What was the secret of his success? Insistence on direct, persuasive, "pragmatic" speaking that would sell the ideas advanced rather than impress listeners with the beauty of the performance.[2] This

(Turn to Page 31)

National Forensic League Finals

University of Denver
June 16-19, 1953

Two hundred and thirty-five of the finest high school speakers from Maine to California will meet at the University of Denver in June to determine which of these students will carry off the top honors of the National Forensic League.

Host to the high schools will be the Department of Speech of the University of Denver under the leadership of the Director of Forensics, Professor Earl E. Bradley. Professor Bradley's intimate knowledge of forensic activities combined with the facilities of the University of Denver will assure a successful national convention for 1953, the twenty-second meeting of the national forensic group. Accommodations will be provided for the students in the University dormitories.

Events to be held during the convention week include: debate, two-member teams from each school participating twice on the affirmative and twice onthe negative with sixteen teams entering the eliminations, ex-tempore speaking, separate contests for boys and girls; original oratory, students will continue in the tournament until ranked in the lower division of a section twice.

In addition to these contests for which eliminations have already been held in each NFL district, the following contests will be open to students who wish to participate in an extra contest: radio announcing and dramatic reading. Radio scripts will be prepared by the University of Denver radio staff and will include all types of broadcasting materials. Dramatic readings will be chosen by the students and prepared in advance from short stories, dramas, or novels.

The debate question to be used is, resolved: that the Atlantic Pact nations should form a federal union.

But Is It Educational?

By BROOKS QUIMBY
Bates College

Shall we allow our debating to be open to the same sort of attacks which are being made against athletics? Any extra-curricular school activity should be justified as an educational procedure and debating is no exception. Have some of our practices such as the trend toward tourneys and their techniques and processes become as non-educational as the bowl games and the basketball tourneys? If so, we should take steps to correct them before objecting to criticism from educators.

Here is one custom in some tourneys which may well be examined carefully on this basis. It is the requirement in these tourneys that each institution be represented by only one team of two speakers who are assigned to defend either side of the proposition, either in rotation, or upon the drawing of lots. This means that these speakers may strongly defend a proposal at two in the afternoon, violently oppose it two hours later, advocate it as the only solution early in the evening, and go to bed fresh from a complete reversal of their original position! Is this a sound educational procedure?

Of course, in some national tourneys, the limitations of travel expense, of housing, and of judges, may give some practical advantages to such a plan. But there are those tourneys which have no such excuse, and those debate directors who defend this practice, not on the ground of practical necessity, but educational advantage. It seems to me that such a stand does not give us stature in the educational field.

In examining such matters, we have to consider some general principles. Personally, I am looking at the situation with certain basic assumptions in mind which mght not be accepted by all of us. Frst, I am assuming that in a democracy, debate is a part of the problem-solving process. This process begins with discussion or inquiry, a cooperative process of finding a solution. When agreement is not thus reacned, the participants take sides on a suggested solution, and debate or advocacy takes place. Here proponents and opponents have made up their minds, and each side seeks to persuade the public that its contentions are valid. The public hears both sides to find the truth and votes as it is convinced.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Dr. Quimby has presented here a thought provoking statement concerning tournament debate practice. Both he and the editors hope that it will stimulate comment both from those who are in accord with his thinking and those who take exception. Debate and discussion, as educational devices, require constant examination if they are to maintain themselves as vital contributions to our students. The pages of SPEECH ACTIVITIES are an appropriate place to contribute to this examination.

Second, I am assuming that our forensic programs are designed to train citizens to face the situations they will face in our democracy, to give them the skills they will need to make this process work. Thus the complete forensic program would have training in discussion as well as debate. Now where does the debate tourney fit into this program? At present, it is my belief, that it is not merely a practice affair held early in the season to prepare debaters to handle audience situations later in the year; it has become more of an end in itself; it comprises the larger part of the actual debating of many, if not most, debaters; it is the climax of the season, the championship affair by which the quality of debate is judged. Admittedly it is an artificial affair and open to many objections such as lack of audience, sharp practices, technical judging, etc., but still it would seem that it can only be justified as a part of the training and development of the individual students.

Is this abrupt change of sides a situation one is likely to face in real life? Does the salesman have to urge people to buy his product in the forenoon and warn them against it in the afternoon? Does the preacher have to defend the Church on Sunday and the Devil on weekdays? Even the politician does not have to be as fickle as that!

Does this type of training help the student indirectly? The chief argument here is that it is desirable in trainng students to see both sides of a proposition. It may be granted that it is highly desirable for a ctizen to see both sides of a question, but does he have to become an advocate to do so? Must the Republican get votes for the Democrats before he can appreciate that there are weaknesses in the Republican position? Must the minister be successful in persuading people to leave the Church before he can see its shortcomings? If so, then our whole civilization has been going at such matters incorrectly for generations.

It seems to me that this searching for the truth, this investigation of all the facts and argument on both sides should come **before** a person becomes an advocate; it should be a part of the process of discussion or inquiry. I would not consider a debater fit to represent the college until he had weighed carefully all possible opposing arguments and looked for all possible damaging evidence. But I have never found it necessary for him to attempt to persuade **others** that this proposition is justified in order to see both sides.

What does our democracy need today? Does it need men and women trained to take either side at the flip of a coin? Or does it need men and women of principle; who will weigh the arguments and evi-

dence carefully before they become advocates? Do we want men and women trained to follow the party line, no matter how often it shifts? Do we want tongues and pens ready to work for the highest bidder? No, I know we do not. Then might we well consider whether such training as is given by this arbitrary assignment first to one side and then another in debate tourneys as a sound educational procedure?

ALBION COLLEGE

(Continued from Page 29)

sounds commonplace to those who are accustomed to our modern techniques of persuasive speaking, but it was revolutionary in Woolbert's elocutionary world.

Then, too, Woolbert encouraged his students to depart from the prevalent biographical type of oration and to deal with current problems and their solution. This is common enough today, but young Professor Woolbert stole a march on his rivals, who took some time to realize and adjust to what was happening.[3]

Intercollegiate debating had come to Albion in 1897, just five years after the famous Harvard-Yale debate. Michigan State Normal School at Ypsilanti challenged Albion, with the provision that Ypsilanti choose the question and that Albion choose the side it preferred. The faculty as a whole accepted the challenge and agreed to pick Albion debaters. The debate occurred on May 28, 1897, at Ypsilanti. Albion upheld the affirmative of the propostion: Resolved, that he peaceful acquisition of Cuba should be the policy of the United States, and lost the votes of the two judges.

Since then there has never been a year in which Albion has not taken part in intercollegiate debate.

It is a far cry from today's squad system of debate preparation to that in force forty years ago. Then the competition to get on a team was as great as the competition between Albion and her foes. The college paper reported in January, 1905, that for a single debate with Washington and Jefferson College thirty men entered the preliminaries. For the first five years only one intercollegiate debate was held each year, and not until after Woolbert's time did the number exceed three.

At least until after teams were finally chosen the faculty member

(Turn to Page 41)

The Editor in Japan

NIPPON HOLIDAY

The first term of school ended in February and the second term does not begin until the middle of April. Consequently, we have been having a long holiday which leaves little forensic activity to report.

We left Sendai shortly after school closed to spend a few days in the Tokyo area. This was our first venture without a friendly interpreter at hand. We started out on our own—that means, with a command of Japanese language considerably less than sensational—and, as we had anticipated, difficulties would soon ensue. They did. Our reservations at a Tokyo hotel had not been held. Persuasion in English was not of much value. It was greeted by smiles and polite bows. Sign language, of which I am also something less than a master, brought approximately the same result. We finally acquired the information that another hotel could give us the accommodations we wanted.

Feeling a bit discouraged and dissatisfied with friendly persuasian, we walked into the lobby of the second hotel with considerable apprehension. The first person to greet us was not the hotel clerk, but an American standing in the lobby whom we had never met. His cordiality was of the nature that accompanies chance meetings of countrymen in foreign lands. To our astonishment, we had just made the acquaintance of Dr. Godshall, newly arrived director of the Fulbright Fellowship for Japan, the man whom we had made the trip to see.

It was only a short time until we had obtained accommodations (complete with private bath, an item of some importance in Japan) and established a warm regard for Dr. and Mrs. Godshall. The next few days were spent in their company, seeing Tokyo and its environs, and discussing the Fulbright activities in the provincial areas of Japan.

The second feature of our vacation was the trip to Nikko. This time, with due regard for our inability in the language, we took with us a Japanese friend, Nobuko Igarashi, the director of the Nanko Gakuen (boys' school in Sendai), and her ten year old son, Michio. Nikko is one of Japan's foremost scenic areas. It is a day's trip by train from Sendai.

The scenery changed from the stretches of farming land and small villages to valleys hemmed in on all sides with mountains. As we climber higher and higher, the vista changed to one of grandeur, with great mountains covered with snow and roaring mountain streams. The hotel was beautiful and comfortable—uncrowded at this time of year. No reservation difficulties this time, but our interpreter, Mrs. Igarashi, was most delightful, explaining the historic and scenic attractions—the red lacquer bridge which spans a roaring stream just below the hotel and the shrine for which Nikko is justly famous. Nikko will remain in our memories as a place of tremendous beauty.

The Debater And His Coach

From Nikko to degating requires considerable transitional adjustment, but considering that it is made, I'd like to dwell briefly upon this largely undefinable relationship, the relationship between the debater and his coach. I do not intend to outline completely the qualifications of a debate coach, but rather to consider some of the elements of his relationship with the student which, over the years, appear to me to have considerable importance. We take it for granted that the debtae coach is competent, efficient in his task of instructing his students, but we see little in print of some other important values of the student-coach relationship.

If the coach himself has participated, as a student, in forensic and other public speaking activities, he has an insight into the psychological reactions of the student in the contest. It is this insight which should tell him when his students need understanding and judicious wisdom from their coach. When the final debate has been lost to an opposing team and life looks bitter, unfair, and cruel to the debater, the coach has a job to do. If he does it well, it could have an influence on the student attitude at forensic tournaments. If he fails or refuses to grapple with this problem, he should not place the blame for a cynical attitude toward

(Turn to Page 35)

Some Potentialities of Mathematical Philosophy in Discussion

Elton S. Carter,
The Pennsylvania State College

Author of "Defining Terms or De scribing Things?" in the General Sermantics Bulletin, Nos. 6 and 7.

When a mathematician like Cassius J. Keyser philosphizes about such problems as those which arise in connection with questions and answers, pseudo-question and pseudo-answers, ambiguity and vagueness, description and definition, postulates and implications, and modes of interpretation, the results may be called mathematical philosophy. When Keyser evaluated problems like these, certain principles of mathematics constituted his primary frame of reference. Although he did not make very many direct applications to the field of discussion, it was my privilege to study his doctrine in relation to argumentation and discussion theories. The purpose of this paper is to indicate some of the forward-looking implications of Keyserian doctrines in discussion.

If a movement in the Keyserian direction is imagined, not as an evolution tempered by doctrinal conservation, but as an unhampered revolution, then it seems reasonable to suppose that discussion theories and practices would rapidly assume a different configuration of emphases from the one most familiar to speech scholars today.

The basic assumption is that discussion is a form of human behaviors devoted to the solving of complex social problems. The general focus is a view of such problems as dynamic networks of relationships. Since the primary purpose would be to preserve the complexities and keep track of changes, the fundamental notion is that of the mathematical variable assigned to the role of prototype. In the sentence, "x is a textbook in discussion," the "x" is a variable of the mathematical type: we know, from the context of "x" that it refers to some textbook in discussion, but which one it refers to is not known. And so the sentence is neither true not false, but ambiguous because "x" is ambiguous. Hence there is no answer to such a question-form as this: "Is x a text-book in discussion"? There are only answers to such ambiguous "questions." Because ambiguous sentences which would be called propositions if they were not ambiguous are called propositional functions. I coined the name interrogational function for ambiguous "questions." A matrix of propositional functions which can be made to yield doctrines was named a doctrinal function by Keyser—a name which seems especially appropriate for discussion theories. One might also have a matrix of interrogational functions. Since undefined terms, interrogational functions, propositional functions, a matrix of interrogational functions, and doctrinal functions are all ambiguous, and since they belong to different levels of complexity, it is useful to view all of them as variables arranged in the order of hierarchical complexity. When such variables are interpreted from what is called an extensional point of view, and when speakers assign a succession of values or constants to them—e.g., specifying which textbook is referred to —then the theory is that accurate linguistic structures may be formulated and maintained. Accurate language, together with invariant relations, would presumably contribute to more dependable predictions. And since solutions would be designed to fit "the problem" at (and following) the date of enactment, predictability would be at a premium.

The crux of the matter is to note that questions for discussion would be formulated and treated as interrogational functions for the sake of preventing an oversimplification of complex social issues.

The Keyserian speaker would presumably be aware that the interrogational function for discussion is not the problem itself. For he would expect that the problem, by comparison, is undoubtedly far more complex than any conventional view of its statement would be likely to suggest. In formulating interrogotional functions, accuracy would be the dominant concern; a deliberate attempt would be made to preserve the complexity of the problem by symbolizing its multifarious relations. This is hardly an attempt to avoid ambiguity, but rather a conscious effort to employ systematic ambiguity in the service of structuring the problem prior to any attempt to solve it. Training in this approach would promote an extensional orientation to problems even when the statements were inherited.

An extensional approach may be characterized by the mode of interpretation. Suppose that a Keyserian speaker inherited what was formerly called a question for discussion. He would treat it as complex variable—not as a question, but as an interrogational function. First, he would spot the undefined terms or variables. He would then enumerate as many sense-giving constants for each set of variables as possible. In other words, he would interpret the interrogational function, thereby de-

riving as many questions as there were sets of values for the variables. Each question would share the verbal form or structure of its interrogational function, but the content or precise subject-matter of each question would differ somewhat from that of every other derived question.

The extent of the total array of questions would be taken as the functional range of the problem, and any one of the questions would be considered as a "statement" of some sub-problem. These sub-problems would be said to constitute "the" problem; the sub-problems would be represented as values of "the problem" taken as a complex variable. And the interrogational function in such cases represents any one of the sub-problems. It represents all of the enumerated sub-problems, not collectively nor conjunctively, but distributively or disjunctively; it represents them, not with the "oneness" of a generalization, but with the successive multiplicity which marks the extensional representation of a variable. To "define" the problem ,then, would not be an attempt to make it one-valued "right off the bat." Rather, it would be an attempt to preserve the multivalued nature of an interrogational function. The aim would be to preserve complexity, not to destroy it by "definition." Then any one of the sub-problems would be something definite to talk about, and talking about the problem would be to talk about its sub-problems before generalizing.

The discussion outline would begin with a postulate, an interrogational function. Next would come the array of questions, the range of which would signify the functional limits of the problem. And then, instead of the conventional "definitions," would come partial but adequate descriptions, not of terms, but of the relations of things represented by the undefined terms or variables. These descriptions, of course, would be based upon observation by some-one. It would be only after observation and description that the Keyserian speaker would be ready to decide how the key terms of his discourse should be employed. Following descriptions, then, would come the attempts at Keyserian (rigorous) definitions which would engage the services of the undefined terms whose referents had been described. And thus, "definition of the problem" would become (1) statement of the interrogational function for discussion; (2) enumeration of questions (sub-problems); (3) description of the sub-problems; and (4) definition of terms. Only after these steps would the Keyserian speaker consider that the portrayal of the problem and his resolutions about his intended use of terms was adequate. Only then would he have made a necessary beginning toward laying his assumptions on the conference table.

NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE AND DISCUSSION QUESTIONS FOR 1953-1954

I. How Should We Select the President of the United States?

Discussion Questions

1. What are the problems of choosing the president of the United States?
2. How can the method of nominating presidential candidates be improved?
3. How can the method of electing the president of the United States be improved?

Debate Propositions

1. Resolved: That the President of the United States should be elected by the direct vote of the people.
2. Resolved: That the electoral vote of each of the states should be cast in proportion to its popular vote.
3. Resolved: That the President of the United States should be elected by the Congress.

In accordance with the framework now set up, the Keyserian speaker would proceed to an "analysis of the problem"—more precisely, a further analysis. His attempt would be to answer the questions already posed. Consequently, two sorts of answers would appear. The answers would be propositions in the Keyserian sense; i.e., statements which could be tested for their truth or falsity because, as propositions instead of propositional functions, they would not be ambiguous. The speaker's Keyserian hypotheticals would assert the logical implications of his postulate and "theorems" (interrogational function and questions). These would have been tested by deduction. But his Keyserian categorical propositions would assert empirical relations. He would have measured these by the standards of observation and description. These categoricals are the fruits of his empirical observations, his study of empirical descriptions, and his empirically-oriented evaluations. He would be careful to distinguish between his inference and facts. He would be keen in noting the various kinds of relationships. With utmost deliberation, he would study, not "relationless things" nor "thingless relations," but the relations of things. His habitual behavior would be in terms of functions in the mathematical sense as described by Keyser: "interdependence and mutual determination among the elements of the world." He would pay special attention to invariant relations; those that survive the flux. Ultimately, he would arrive at his Keyserian categoricals, and he would state them in his discussion outline. They would appear as the last item of each set of assertions. Each set would begin with a statement of the speaker's assumptions, followed by an array of statements which portrayed the data upon which the assumptions were based. Then the categorical proposition of each set would for its empirical truth or falsity, not by talking about it, but by observation. The talking might center around methods of testing the propositions by observations.

In the context of the discussion itself, the Keyserian catagorical propositions become the ifs of possible solutions, and they would be stated as such. The Keyserian speaker would realize that moving from an analysis of the problem to possible solutions is to move from backward-looking to forward-looking views. Problems are actualities; they are subject to change without notice. Consequently, it is only if the categoricals in question are true of tomorrow's problem, as well as "the problem" under discussion, that any solutions can be proposed in good faith. So, the Keyserian speaker would include his categoricals as the explicit ifs of his possible solutions. Then, on the basis of invariant relations accurately expressed, he would set forth a second set of ifs. These would be explicit categorical predictions concerning the various ramifications of the problem at some future date. The groundwork would

(Turn to Page 35)

The Panel of Americans: An Experiment in Human Relationships

By Dominic A. LaRusso

"Neither free no equal." This sentiment, describing the conditions of many minority group members, has been widely used to explain the existence of professional and amateur anti-bigots. It might very well be used to explain the existence of the Panel of Americans, one such amateur group composed of student citizens — representatives of various faiths and cultures—whose expressed purpose is to do something constructive about the problem of racial and religious intolerance in America.

Group activity of the past, although it represents an important part of American heritage, has not always been an efficient means of implementing the democratic ideal. While group efforts such as work-sharing at harvest time, barn-raising, town meetings, labor unions, etc., all provided opportunities to meet and discuss community matters, more often than not they provided more effort than effect—more pomp than circumstance. Not until recently has it been realized that the participants in group activity, in order to further democratic principles and achieve group goals, should be aware of the importance of their methods as well as their results. It is now recognized that the results of such group activity are influenced profoundly by the methods used. It is now recognized, also, that the modern discussion group is one of the most useful and significant examples of cooperative activity. The Panel of Americans is such a group activity.

The Panel of Americans emphasizes both the techniques and the results of cooperative effort; it is a group endeavor with cooperation as its motivating spirit and discussion as its method; it is an experiment

in human relationships. As conducted at the University of Washington, the Panel of Americans has three major aims. First, it hopes to develop an appreciation for the efficacy of group discussion as a community process; it hopes to exemplify the value of mutual exchange as opposed to isolated individual effort. To this end, panel members spend much time in research, study, and practice. Second, it attempts to lead people, by example and suggestion, from an attitude of polite, passive interest in problems of intolerance to an active habit of earnest participation. To this end, an objective analysis of the problem of racial and religious intolerance is presented, solutions to the problems are offered, and a forum is provided to encourage audience response. Finally, through the individual and collective work of its members, it seeks to make a contribution toward overcoming American problems of intolerance. To this end, panel members turn the light of objective analysis upon conditions that are bad for our country because they are bad for our people.

As originally conceived at UCLA in the years before the Second World War, the Panel of Americans was composed of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish students who spoke together on the need for an American religious renaissance. At the outbreak of the war, as a direct response to the growing problems of racial conflict in and around Los Angeles, the original group was expanded to include a Negro, an Oriental, and a Mexican-American; the theme was also expanded to include racial cooperation. The idea met with immediate success, and the Panel of Americans was formally instituted as an activity sponsored by the University Religious Conference with headquarters in Los Angeles. Because of the great amount of success experienced with the original panel group, the University Religious Conference established an extension department for the purpose of encouraging formation of similar panel groups throughout the country. Thus, the original thought has already come to bear fruit in approximately 15 different colleges and universities spread from coast to coast.

During the school year 1950-51, the Panel of Americans was projected locally by the University of Wash-

(Turn to Page 49)

SOME POTENTIALITIES OF MATHEMATICAL PHILOSOPHY IN DISCUSSION

(Continued from Page 33)

now be laid down for possible solutions whether the problem changes significantly or not. If it changes, the first set of ifs would serve as guides only insofar as the future problem is similar to the problem previously analyzed. Of course predictions would be founded upon the past. But all of the possible solutions would be based entirely on predictions, including the possible prediction that the problem would not have changed significantly by the date of enactment.

Such a speaker's conclusions would be tentative as a matter of genuine humbleness in the face of shifting complexities.

He would attempt to help the discussion group adjust its course of action to the course of events. For it would not be among the expectations of Keyserians that complex social problems would be accomodatingly static while speakers solved them.

Thus prepared and oriented, the imaginary Keyserian discusses some problem with other Keyserian colleagues. On the conference table their collected hosts of assumptions lie. There is little need to pry loose latent dogmatisms. Each is the other's critic, and each has done his best to aid his crtiics. Discussion is now a method for harvesting viewpoints, where participants respect one another as sources of potentially useful viewpoints. Facts are now the instruments of prediction, and personal value-systems are the fruits of conditioning which enable different people to see different aspects of problems. Lessons reaped from the past have their faces turned toward the future. Problems of policy are static, oversimplified creatures no longer; they are more challenging, now, in their great and growing complexity. The pursuit is an endless pursuit of excellence, and the excellence is one of keeping solutions adjusted to problems.

EDITOR IN JAPAN

(Continued from Page 31)

competition upon the student alone or upon the fact that there is such a thing as competition or debate tournaments.

If the coach is also a teacher in the highest sense of the word, he is concerned with something more than "victories" in debate. The ultimate success and development of his student is the goal he must consider. Just as he must handle the situation of disappointment over loss of a crucial debate, he must handle the student who never "loses a debate" and who refuses to heed instruction, the kind of student who, when multiplied by half a dozen or more, can make the tournament an unhappy experience for its directors, judges, and students alike. Undoubtedly, there comes a time in the lives of many students when they need a defeat to brood over much more than they need another victory. For even the best coach it is not an easy situation, but the wise forensic director will see that the student gets the experience that is needed and do so without violating the creed of respect and fair play which must be written between himself and the debater.

Once, on a long trip with a group of men debaters, we stopped overnight at an auto court in a small Arizona town. Before retiring we held a long discussion and one of my debaters who had been difficult to coach and who had been unwilling to accept instruction suddenly said to me, "Prof., I just wanted to tell you before we get home, that you have been right all the time. I can see it now and I want to say that I am sorry I didn't pay more attention to what you said. I can see now it was for our good."

The Debater And The Judge

If the coach is also a judge, he knows the attitude he must attempt to stimulate in his students with regard to judges. He knows that the judge can give only one affirmative decision or one negative decision per debate and that the decision must be respected as fully in forensics as the decision of the referee on the football field. He knows that no student has a right to contest the decision of the judge. He can do much to influence the thinking of his students regarding the attitude they should assume toward the judge of the debate.

Upon one occasion at a national tournament I was judging a close debate between two able teams. A situation arose which was not clear, so I asked the members of one team a question at the close of the debate. After replying, they left the room and went to headquarters to complain about my decision. I met them coming away as I went to turn in my ballot. Immediately, I

(Turn to Page 42)

Leadership In Contest Discussion

LAURA CROWELL
University of Washington
Seattle

We are all concerned with the problems which face us in our attempt to make contest discussion an event of value to the participants. One of the problems which arise is that of leadership in the discussion groups. We arrange to have a number of participants meet as a group through several rounds of discussion, and we evaluate their work with a different judge in each round. But how do we meet the problem of affording leadership to each group?

We have used a number of methods: (1) We have designated a participant, perhaps at the suggestion of his director, to act as chairman of his group throughout the three or four rounds making up the competition. (2) We have designated a participant to be chairman for one round only, returning him to membership in the same group for the other rounds. Thus the group has a different one of its members acting as chairman each round. (3) We have brought in a skilled outsider —not a contestant—to act as leader throughout the rounds. (4) We have designated no leader at all, assuming that appropriate leadership would emerge from the members. (5) We have rotated the chairmanship among the members so that each one became leader of his group during a share of **one** of the rounds of the tournament. (6) We have rotated the chairmanship among the members so that each one became leader of his group during a share of **each** of the rounds of the tournament.

Let us consider each of these methods in turn as to its usefulness in contest discussion.

(1) Continuing Chairmanship

If we designate one of the contestants in each group to act as chairman of his group throughout the tournament, we must, of course, rate his performance as leader. To do so yields several practical difficulties. Doubtless all of us would agree that the components of a good chairmanship job are not the same in essence or in proportion as those of an equally good membership job. Thus the judge would have to be using not one rating scale but two—one for the members, and a different one for the leader. This complicates the judge's already difficult task of evaluation.

Furthermore, the assumption would have to be made that a good chairmanship job is worth **more, the same,** or **less,** than a good membership job. And we cannot make a blanket assumption on this point!

An even more troublesome problem arises from the arrangement of rating a chairman separately from the group. In our philosophy of discussion a chairman must be willing to see leadership emerge in the group—indeed, he must aid and abet such an emergency—but if he is to be judged on his own performance of chairing duties he will be rightfully loath to let these responsibilities be performed freely by the group. He will be in the undesirable position of working himself out of a good rating by fostering good ratings for the members. And if the group which he is chairing is so good a working unit that it assumes these leadership duties without any active fostering action on his part, how then is he to be assessed fairly? Since we hold that the performance of these duties is to be done by him **only** if **not** done by the group, we are talking of a fluid situation in which judgment of the leader separately from the group is not a valid procedure. Because we cannot rate chairmanship accurately in distinction from the group, the use of the **continuing chairmanship** is not feasible.

(2) Chairmanship For Single Round

We may aks one member of the group to assume the chairmanship of his group for one round, then to act as a member while other participants act as chairman in the other rounds. If we use this procedure, we use again the unrealistic approach of separating leader and member functions; we further pose ourselves the difficult job of evaluating these individuals who serve as both leader and member in the same contest.

In addition, a member who has served as chairman in an early round is truly not able to be just a member in the succeeding rounds. He may strive to be, but the others may find it difficult to forget his previous authority; he does not face the same conditions of membership as the others who have not assumed (or are not assigned to assume) the function of chairman.

This solution is undesirable because a chairman should not be separated from the group for judgment, cannot be judged as chairman on the same elements as they as members, and cannot be fairly judged as a member if he once acts as designated chairman.

(3) Non-Competing Chairmanship

If we assign someone skilled in leadership to act as chairman but not to enter the competition of the tournament, we may think we have set fair conditions for the members. But in this arrangement one of the most important elements in the situation—the chairman—is operating under different states of stress from the other elements—the members—and this fact would tend to destroy the development of that fluidity of function and that **we-ness** of operation that are basic to good discussion. We are selling ourselves short in our goals of discussion if we set up such a situation.

(4) Emergent Chairmanship

Suppose that we arrange groups with no designation of leadership

Granted that many of the duties of the **leader**—such as initiating new lines of thought, soliciting the participation of hesitant members, synthesizing and summarizing thought, etc.—may indeed be assumed by **members** in a well-functioning group, there still remain duties which the group needs to have performed for it by one designated to do them. So elementary a need as quiet assignment of the "floor" when several members happen to speak simultaneously can be more handily performed by a designated chairman than by any member. Whenever the group needs a focus, that need can be more satisfactorily met by an assigned leader.

(5) Tournament-Rotating Chairmanship

If each member is to act as designated chairman for part of one of the rounds, we have simplified the situation somewhat but not sufficiently. In a three-round tournament with nine participants in a group each member would thus serve as chairman for 1/3 and as member for 2 2/3 rounds. Although this arrangement keeps the total functioning of each participant the same for the whole competitive event, yet the change of judges from round to round would mean that the members would be performing different functions before different judges. That condition would render valid summarization of judgments on the different rounds impossible.

(6) Round-Rotating Chairmanship

If each member of the group is to act as designated chairman a share of the time in **each** round, his function will be the same before each judge as that of every other member. The judges will then be seeing each contestant briefly as chairman, and the remainder of the time as member. Such rotation of chairmanship by its sharing of responsibility emphasizes the **we-ness** of the group, yet provides a focal point at any given moment if the group needs it. It also makes possible a rating of each participant under the same conditions by each judge.

With such advantages for this method of rotation, several questions may yet be raised. MIGHT NOT THE PASSING OF THE CHAIRMANSHIP FROM ONE TO ANOTHER INTERRUPT THE FLOW OF THINKING OF THE GROUP TOO MUCH?

Doubtless such a result would occur if the group were so large that each member's share as chairman lasted only a few minutes. If, however, the discussion groups are kept relatively small — from five to eight, a size desirable for other reasons also—no such interruption would result. A round of 60 or 90 minutes would then allow each person a ten or twelve minute chairmanship. Furthermore, if each participant realizes that, in passing the chairmanship to the next person, he is expected to make a summary of the proceedings only if that is what the group needs done at that moment, the rotation need not be disruptive.

WILL IT NOT BE CONFUSING FOR THE PARTICIPANTS TO KEEP TRACK OF THE TIME FOR ROTATING THE CHAIRMANSHIP?

This awareness of time can be a duty of the judge. He can advise the group at the outset with which person the rotation will start, and in which direction it will proceed. At appropriate intervals he can indicate the passing of the chairmanship responsibility. Since his judgment of the participants must take some account of the effectiveness with which time is used by the group, the judge will add little to his former duties by assuming this responsibility.

(Turn to Page 52)

In The September Issue

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

You Will Find ---

1. ★ An Analysis of the National High School Debate Question — Written by a trio of Forensic Experts.
2. ★ A Symposium Analyzing the National College Debate Question.
3. ★ A Study Plan for High School Students which will Assist in Programming the Preparation for Debating and Discussion.
4. ★ The National Forensic League Winners for 1952-53.
5. ★ Results of the SPEECH ACTIVITIES High School Contest.
6. ★ Tabulation of Ballots on the Debate in the March Issue.
7. ★ And a Variety of Articles on Subjects of Interest to Debaters and Participants in Discussion.

The Winning Discussion

NATIONAL CONTEST IN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Editor's note: The following discussion, presented by students of Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire, Wisconsin, won the highest rating in the National Contest in Public Discussion for 1952. Miss Grace, Walsh, Chairman of the Department of Speech, directed the group. The National Contest in Public Discussion is conducted by Wayne N. Thompson, Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois. For additional information, see SPEECH ACTIVITIES, Spring, 1953. A picture of the group appears on the cover.

Communism versus capitalism involves the future social and economic status of the entire world. One of the basic problems of the free western world is self-preservation, the problem of meeting the advancing tide of communism. Therefore, today, we are discussing the question of how can we most effectively stem the rising tide of communism. In our discussion group we have Miss Patricia Lutza, Miss Joan Reidy, Mr. George Gerner, Mr. Richard Bennett and your moderator, William Larson. First of all, who would like to explain the theory of communism? Mr. Gerner.

Well, Mr. Larson, it might be interesting, first of all, to point out that the word communism, itself, comes from a Latin poet, communus, meaning common. It means a community organized. Now the New Encyclopedia of Social Reform points out a definition which is rather difficult to come to on such a controversial term which points out that communism is the economic theory which advocates the total or partial abolition of the right of private property, actual ownership being ascribed to the community as a whole, or to the state.

Miss Ready.

The basic philosophy of communism seems to be that labor income of society should be distributed equally among all its members by former constitutional authority. The aim of communism is, then, equality of pains and pleasures. Men will work according to their capacities and receive according to their needs.

Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Chairman, the goals of the communist party are many. Communism being primarily economic was not intended to meddle in political affairs any more than absolutely necessary and all persons to be free and independent in action except naturally in relation to one another. Also they advocate free education in their own sponsored public schools. Mr. Chairman, in achieving this the society goes through four stages. The first of these is revolution, the second a working man dictatorship, the third to abolish all police powers of the state, and the final one, final freedom caused by political and economic satisfaction of all the people.

Miss Lutza.

According to the Communist Manifesto the low conditions of a nation are caused by class struggle. Marx believes that class struggle is in turn caused by the social classes themselves. The social class is caused by competition. Therefore, according to Marx's theory, if capital is taken over by the state, competition will be eliminated, and without competition, the social class will not exist. And so you see the class struggle will be eliminated and therefore the classes will benefit. In other words, in order to replace competition with cooperation the classes will benefit.

Mr. Gerner.

I think that one thing that Miss Lutza brings out points out the basicness of this conflict between communism versus our capitalistic system here in the west. Since communism, of necessity, must do away with social classes, I believe that this is a basic indictment against the capitalistic system. Now social classes are set up because of economc classes. If we are to do away with the social classes then in turn we must do away with the economic classes. Now, therefore, since communism, in its basic difference from socialism, means bringing about common ownership of property without reimbursement, this condition must be brought about by revolution, taking this property away from the rightful owners and putting it in the hands of the state. Thus we can see that the basic conflict of communism versus democracy and capitalism of the west is this idea of revolution to forcibly take control of privately owned property.

In other words we could say that as a democracy we have a basic concept that man is capable of controlling his own destiny and must be given that opportunity. Whereas under the communistic form of government the man is an individual who has no dignity and he is the slave and fool of the state.

I think we pointed out, Miss Lutza, that although communism has some very idealistic goals — Mr. Bennet pointed out better education, cooperation instead of competition and so forth—yet, the things that they must do in order to achieve these goals would certainly overshadow the benefits which would be brought about by them.

Well, now that we have some idea of communism in theory, let's go to communism in practice, what is it actually doing in the world today and what has it done?

Miss Lutza.

According to Harold Stassen, nine-tenths of the communist drive today is underground. He pointed out that the operations are directly under the instructions coming from Moscow. The administrative and the organizations themselves are what we see above the ground.

Again we should emphasize her

that communism believes in overthrowing the government by a revolution. I think that that is an important fact that we should keep in thought in the discussion at all times.

Although it is very important that they believe it must be done by revolution, I believe that in the United States we can see another technique working. We can say that in one sense it is revolutionary because I imagine that most of you hadn't even heard about communism before the year of 1933. And we can see today what great impetus it is getting as far as membership in the United States. I was reading, recently, a report on the investigation of communists in labor unions in Los Angeles and was amazed to find out that at least 10 per cent of the people in the labor unions in Los Angeles are members of the communist party, and I believe that we can see that this in itself is not revolutionary and yet it is a gigantic gain.

I think that one of the statements that was brought out by Miss Reidy here—that many people did not even hear of the American Communist party until 1933, possibly, this was not meant to be the exact date—however it was found that the American Communist party was actually instituted in Chicago in September of 1919, and yet we did not become aware of it until several years later. Now the way by which communists bring about the statement of their interests and the rising influence of communism is by infiltrating underhandedly into such fields as banking, newspapers, education, government, even religion. Communists can rapidly gain power by bringing their ideas before the American people through acceptable and reliable, supposedly, sources.

Mr. Gerner has pointed out how the communists come into force.

One person in 155 is a communist in the world as far as a world basis is concerned. The faith today of communism is Marxism and Leninism as operated by Joseph Stalin. In 1943 the communist party was in form in Canada and it was in the form of a Labor Progressive Working Party. In 1940, however, Canada did outlaw the communist party, and so, pointing out as Mr. Gerner has mentioned previously, that the communist party comes into force by force and that is just exactly what did happen in Canada.

And in this idea of communism coming into power through force, it is not necessary that this force be through overwhelming numbers. We pointed out that in Russia at the time of the revolution, there was only one communist for every 2,777 people. Here there is one communist for every 1,814 people. Comparatively, the communists have a better chance for overcoming through forceful revolution the United States than they did when they succeeded in Russia.

Well, I think we have decided that the communists move mainly through infiltration, not necessarily by revolution alone, as Mr. Gerner pointed out, by strong power alone, but by infiltration. Let's move on to the next subject which is counteracting communism.

Miss Reidy.

I believe we should keep in mind one basic factor when we're talking about what we can do about communism in the United States, and that is that the only way you can defeat communism in the United States, is by making democracy work. As long as democracy is such a contrast to communism, as far as the dignity of man is concerned, I believe that when we think about the possible solutions today we should always keep in mind that the most basic solution is making democracy work today.

The government of the United States has had numerous laws in order to combat these subversive organizations. The Espionage Act of 1917 is a good example of one of the first of these laws. This placed heavy penalties for obtaining or disclosing information affecting the national defense of the United States.

I think there is one thing that is definitely important here and that is, as Miss Reidy pointed out, we must make democracy work in combating communism. Marx pointed out in his Communist Manifesto that the basis for the advancement of communism is working in order to answer supposedly the misery, oppression and servitude of the so-called dispossessed mass of the workers. Now, therefore, if we can make democracy work then we are making a definite step towards overcoming communism.

One thing which the United States has done today has been done through the states themselves and that was that fifteen states at the present time have outlawed the communists as far as ballots are concerned.

Miss Reidy.

I was going to point out here—as long as we're talking about laws that have been passed—that one of the most recent laws to be suggested and possibly a solution is the Nixon-Ferguson act, which was going to go into effect as soon as the senate passed it which would make all communists register as communists. The object being, of course, to ferret out those people who are communists in the United States today. Now the group can decide or discuss whether or not they think this act has any advantages, it certainly would have many shortcomings.

Mr. Gerner.

Well, in considering this bill, which involved the requiring of all communists to state themselves and determine themselves as being communists, it's rather interesting to note that in the United States News, for January 1, 1952, it was found that first degree communists, so-called, or card carrying members of the communist party numbered only 100,000 in the United States. However, so-called second degree communists numbered 1,000,000. Now these are fellow travelers, mis-labeled progressives and liberals who give moral and financial support to communist movements, who would arise under the red banner in case of a forceful move such as revolution and yet are not actually communist members. Therefore, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make the communists in the United States identify themselves as such.

In other words, how are you going to decide who is communist and who is not?

Miss Lutza.

Some of our leaders in the United States today have found that it also is difficult to decide just who is a communist, because not since 1948 have any communist cards been issued in the United States.

Mr. Bennett.

Numerous other laws have been presented in assemblies, congresses of the United States recently. The Sheppard Bill, the Rankin Bill and the Hobbes Bill are all bills which have something to do with either combatting the thing altogether or just part of it so we are definitely interested in trying to get down to the exact fundamentals on the

things which we should combat.
Mr. Gerner.

Now in bringing out this idea of laws. We're mentioning laws, here. We're going to outlaw the various things. As possibilities we're naming such laws which exist at the present time. But let's not forget one basic thing. And that is in attempting to preserve our freedoms, in trying to protect them, let us not in that effort actually destroy them. By what I mean, in working against communism, let us not make it necessary for every man that is going to take his opinion on various subjects to be constantly afraid of government action and being labelled as a "red" or at least a "pink" in such a case. We find that in all too many cases, even though a defendant in such a case is found innocent, he does not come away from such a case unscathed, at lease in in the field of public opinion. In the case of Copland for instance, where they used various sources of information yet kept the names of those sources secret so the defendant could not protect himself or herself against them.

Mr. Chairman, this brings into mind one of the most important factors, I believe, in fighting communism in a democracy. I am sure that we are all very well acquainted with Senator Joseph McCarthy from Wisconsin and the rather questionable technique he uses for ferreting communists out of the government. I'm sure that you've all seen his guilt by association test put into existence and probably most of you heard his speech the other night, where he not only quoted out of context but by inference included many people in the communistic form of government that certainly did not belong there—Mr. Stevenson, for example. Whether Democrat or Republican, I'm sure that most of us wouldn't go so far as to say that by his associates Mr. Stevenson has proven himself a communist. I believe that this is one of the basic things we have to overlook in our fight for communism.
Mr. Bennett.
Mr. Gerner.

I'm sure we're all agreed that this is a new idea in this way of combating communism. Certainly, if he is not combating it, he is calling attention of the government, of the people, to it.

Very definitely he is calling attention to it.

Well, calling attention to it one way or the other, certainly he has called attention to himself. Some people agree with him, some people do not. There have been definite attacks made against him, and definite things said for him. And yet in making these various stands for and against him we should remember one thing, that if Mr. McCarthy was making incorrect statements, making statements against people that would hurt their reputations, would hurt their interests, then he would be a potential target for a libel suit. Now so far in the cases which have been brought against Senator McCarthy, in that way, and incidentally that number is very few considering the number of people he has implicated in his various statements, Senator McCarthy has not been found guilty in any of these cases of seditious libel.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out that it isn't necessary to tell a bold-face lie in order to intimidate someone that should not be intimidated. I would like to bring to Mr. Gerner's attention the fact that although he did not possibly tell a lie in his speech about a week ago, he did distort facts so and quote out of context so much that he brought people to many conclusions that were not valid merely by quoting out of context and using guilt by association, which I'm sure Mr. Gerner himself would not condone.

Well, I have to admit I'm not coming out either in defense or against Mr. McCarthy, but I meant to point out one thing and that is in this idea of communism versus democracy in the field of Senator McCarthy we must remember that so far no law has pointed out that Mr. McCarthy was definitely incorrect, violating a law in bringing about these statements of untruth which Miss Reidy has pointed out may not always be of the highest authority or the highest intention. Therefore, that is one method, one problem that we must watch in this best methods of combating communism.

I'm sorry to interrupt this discussion, this is one of those problems that I'm sure we could go on with for some time. However, I would like to ask the group if there are any more suggestions on combatting communism.

Mr. Chairman I'd like to ask the group one thing. Since communism is a world power, do you believe that it would be possible to unite militarily against communism?
Miss Reidy.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that there would be many people who would say that this would be a practical solution, however, I'd like to point out right at the outset, some of the things that could happen as the result of such a union. In the first place, such a regional union would upset the balance in the United Nations. As it is set up today, the United Nations operates through the individual nations. Secondly, I'm sure that it would speed up the preparations for war, because it would emphasize the difference between the two separate armed camps, which I'm sure you would agree result. I don't even believe that nations today are ready for such a union, because we all still are grasping what little sovereignty we have left today, and for that reason, because each nation wants to keep as much sovreignty as it possibly has, I believe that it's impractical from that viewpoint.

I think that as Miss Ready pointed out, we are looking here for a most effective means of combating communism and we also must keep track of the most desirable means of combating communism. Certainly, if we are to have an armed camp in the western world against an armed camp in the eastern world, well then possibly, in this atomic age, very dire results could come of it.

Well, the United States is trying to set up an organization called the M.E.D.O., or the Middle East Defense Organization. Now this is primarily to combat communist in the Middle East. It's a new idea of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that we can see that if we had such an overwhelming group of nations or such a group with such an amount of power behind it, it would dwarf all the individual nations that we have today in the United Nations organizations. I don't see how it would be possible to have the United Nations organization the goal of which is peace, go out hand-in-hand or in any way be correlated with a military union whose objective could only be one thing and that is preparation for war. The two goals to me don't seem symonymous, peace and war.

Now, we should remember one thing, sir, in considering this idea of communism versus democracy as an armed camp of the east against an armed camp of the west, as an answer, we should remember that

war is not necessarily inevitable according to the basic theories of communism. Now, according to the current Stalin doctrine, war is not demanded. Stalin believes that capitalism will fall of its own weight because of its inner "contradictions" which it embodies. Thus, it is the duty of communists all over the world to pry upon the down-trodden, so-called, workers of the world. Now if we could work against this down trodden condition, possibly we could answer communism in that way.

Mr. Gerner, the United States is trying to work against these down trodden people by spending millions on the Middle East. Generally, they're doing this to prevent Russia from getting its clutches on the many oil pools which are in the Middle East, to open the back door of Europe to democratic ideals, and also to prevent communistic ideas and tendencies in the back door of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wonder just how effective this huge amount of money we're spending for economic aid is for combating communism. In the last five years we have seen an expenditure of some thirteen billion dollars of the American taxpayer's money to combat communism in Europe. While we were doing this, though, we let it knock at and almost enter the back door of China and the Far East. Our relief program in our foreign policies, it would seem to me, have been all wrong, because it is my firm belief that we cannot teach the world the benefit to be derived from our form of government by allowing its destruction from within, by the very persons we are fighting in foreign fields. In other words, it seems to me that we're defeating our own purpose in sending this large amount of money to contain communism in foreign countries while we're letting it creep into the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if as another method to combat communism, we couldn't bring in education along that line.

Along that line, Miss Lutza, another idea to combat this communism has been suggested: that it would be a good idea to go out and form a committee, form a group, that would give and teach the people of these down-trodden countries, teach them how to read and write, and then it would be up to the United States, to furnish them with democratic books and pamphlets to read.

I think that Mr. Bennett has brought out a very definite point there, and I think that this idea of education is of definite importance in combating communism. Communism versus democracy, two things which deal with the mind as well as the stomach. We must educate the mind in order to help meet these conditions of emptiness in the stomach. Now religion, then, since communism is so definitely against it, which we can see according to the **Information Please Almanac of 1951,** that the number of religious congregations in Russia dropped 75% since the revolution. Apparently, then, in also considering the case of Cardinal Mindzenty and others, in the various communist overtaken nations, we see that religion is a definite source of headache to the communist powers. If we can increase the power of religion as an educational force, then with the other phases of education we can meet the problem of communism as it appeals to unenlightened intellectualism.

I'm afraid our time is running a little short. I think this would be a good time for a summary of what we have said so far in this discussion. First of all we started out with the theory of communism, giving some of the basic ideals of communism, the first ideals, we went from there into the practices of communism and actual practices today such as infiltration, and revolution, how they take over a nation. And from there we went to how we can combat communism, such as by strengthening our own democracy which was the first point we brought out, and a very good idea that we must not destroy our own freedoms in trying to defend them. Some more of the specific suggestions as to what we can do to help rid the world of communism, were in the way of legislation, such as the Espionage Act, the outlawing of communism by votes in many states, the Ferguson-Nixon Act. McCarthyism and military unity against communism, economic aid and our last one, education and religion, and the important part that these factors play in eliminating communism in the world. We hope that this discussion, though we realize that we've not been able to cover the complete scope of this great problem in detail, will serve as a reminder to the people of America that we must constantly be on guard against the threat of communism.

ALBION COLLEGE

(Continued from Page 31)

had little to do with their training, however. Arrangements for the intercollegiate debates, challenges, answers, choice of questions, sides and debaters were largely in the hands of the oratorical association or committee made up of representatives from literary societies, fraternities and sororities, and the faculty.

To choose debaters the oratorical committee posted a notice of a coming debate and requested those interested in participating to sign up. Preliminary debates were then held, with three members on a side, each having ten minutes for a main speech and five minutes for rebuttal. Townspeople rather than possibly prejudiced faculty members acted as judges to choose the three best debaters, judged individually.

Case preparation was exhaustive. The material prepared by each entrant in the preliminaries was turned over to the chosen team. This material was supplemented by much study and by trips to large library centers for research.

From the first, questions debated were of the policy type and dealt with current issues: compulsory arbitration of labor disputes (1902), state income tax (1905), single Presidential term of six years (1911).

Although in later years and under other able teachers and coaches excellent records in intercollegiate competition have been made, probably there has never been such a combination of contest success and popular support as that in evidence during the period about 1910. Whole issues of the college paper were given over to accounts of a particular debate. If the event was an outstanding oratorical contest, the sppeches of the winners were printed in full, with commentaries on Albion's contestant in comparison with others.

When debates were held locally, not only students but townspeople and farmers from miles around jammed the chapel to the window sills to hear these word-and-wit battles. At least one of the participants believes the audience came more for the fight than for enlightenment.

Be that as it may, Woolbert made a secure place for speech. A local chapter of Delta Sigma Rho was established in 1911. Student assist-

ants and then a full-time instructor marked a growing department of English and oratory. It was with a deep sense of loss that Albion saw him move on in 1913 to the University of Illinois.

Women did not enter intercollegiate debating until 1916 but since then have been active and successful. In oratory they have established an enviable record since an Albion woman won the coeducational first state contest of the Michigan Intercollegiate Oratorical Association in 1898. In 1914 Ethel Bedient took first place over ten male rivals, representing as many states, in the eastern interstate prohibition contests. Since separate contests for women were set up by the state league in 1909 Albion's representatives have won at least twelve first places.

The period since World War I has been marked by consistent progress in both curricular and extracurricular developments.

In 1921 Henry Lee Ewbank, newly graduated from Ohio Wesleyan, who had come to Albion four years earlier as an instructor in English and public speaking, was made chairman of a new and separate department of public speaking. When he went to the University of Wisconsin in 1927 he was succeeded by Nicholas J. Weiss. In 1931 the department took the name Speech. At Weiss' death in 1936 Kenneth G. Hance, who had joined the staff from Olivet College two years earlier, became chairman, to be succeeded, in turn, by Carroll P. Lahman in 1940 and Jasper V. Garland in 1948. Various able instructors and assistant professors have served during the years since Woolbert was given a faculty assistant in 1909. In 1951-52 the department numbered three full-time and two part-time teachers.

With the growth in personnel has gone growth in course offerings and in activities. The college catalog listed only six courses in 1920; in 1950 there were over twenty, including radio and speech correction. From 1931 until 1950 all freshmen devoted part of their required English course to oral work under speech instructors. Freshmen may now elect one or two semesters of beginning speech.

In 1934-35 the department came fully of age with the offering of a major of twenty-four hours.

During these years, too, developments in forensics followed in rapid succession. Ewbank instiuted the squad system for debate in 1921-22 and helped establish a state league the next year. Squads increased in size, and schedules became more extended, with numerous trips out of state. Various styles of debate were experimented with. In 1930-31 the Michigan Debate League reduced the size of teams from three to two members, and the next year its first tournament was held at Albion. Two years later debate and oratory were combined in one state league, which sponsors contests also in extempore speaking, discussion, and interpretative reading. Several international debates were held between the two world wars. Discussion, through Delta Sigma Rho national congresses and community-wide projects, has played an increasingly large role on the forensic stage. A student speakers bureau was set up in 1941.

Local participation in forensics has been encouraged by an unusual series of prizes, ranging from rotating cups in extempore speaking presented by the local chapter of Delta Sigma Rho in honor of Nicholas J. Weiss and Kenneth G. Hance, to substantial cash prizes in class and all-school oratory and discussion for men and women. In all, the college catalogue now lists fifteen such awards.

Drama was a late arrival at Albion. OEDIPUS TYRANNUS had been presented in Greek as early as 1894 under the direction of F. S. Goodrich, and various language departments had given plays from time to time. Reference has been made to non-costume presentation of Shakespearean plays by Woolbert's interpretation classes. However, it was not until January, 1922, that the first regular dramatic performance was publicly presented to on Albion College audience, when three one-act plays were given by members of the interpretation class.

The reason for the late appearance of drama is not clear but is probably found in the poor physical facilities of the college chapel at that time and the primary interest in other fields of speech on the part of earlier teachers. It may also be associated with the previous hostile attitude of the Methodist Church toward the theater.

Responsible for dramatics' establishment and rapid growth was Miss Florence Swisher, an Ohio Wesleyan alumna, whose special field was interpretation and dramatics. A Histrionic Club was soon founded, and during her seven-year stay a brilliant succession of varied plays was presented before local and numerous off-campus groups.

Miss Swisher was followed by Beulah G. Champ from Nebraska Wesleyan University, whose twenty-one years of service after 1928 have been the longest in the history of speech instruction at Albion College. Intent always on the educational values of interpretation and dramatics, with a finely sensitive nature and the higher personal standards, Miss Champ taught classes in her field, directed and produced a steady succession of significant plays through the years and sent contestants into the state interpretative contests that usually ranked high. In 1929 she was instrumental in securing for the college a chapter of Theta Alpha Phi When she gave up dramatic coaching in 1944 she was succeeded by James W. Brock. Always she was successful in securing the enthusiastic cooperation of large numbers of students. One such former student in 1946 established in her honor the Beulah G. Champ Drama Award of $50 to be given annually to the student "judged most outstanding for the year in the pursuit of the dramatic arts."

Every college has its own special features, its problems, its strengths and weaknesses. Some of the developments traced here are largely duplicated elsewhere; others are unique. For more than seventy-five years participation in speech has been a significant factor in the Albion College student's education.

EDITOR IN JAPAN

(Continued from Page 35)

was the victim of considerable recrimination. The look of amazement on their faces was unforgettable when I said to them, "Don't you fellows want this decision?" Their apologies were profuse, but such apologies do not make up for the lack of judgment which should have been instilled in our students.

The relationship between a teacher and student is one of these particularly indefinable things. The teacher must be prepared professionally, he must love his students and his profession, and finally, he must sustain a relationship with his students which is not a matter

(Turn to Page 52)

Tournament Results

NORTHEASTERN STATE COLLEGE
SPEECH TOURNAMENT
Tahlequah, Oklahoma
March 19-21

James Robinson, Director
One Act Plays

CLASS A

Muskogee — Superior
Miami — Superior

CLASS B

Bristow — Superior
Tahlequah — Superior

CLASS C

Yukon — Superior
Colbert — Superior

Radio Speaking—Women

CLASS A

1st Ladonna Miles, Sand Springs
2nd Saramay Wiley, Classen, Oklahoma City
3rd Janet Maib, Ponca City

CLASS B

1st Cynthia Hodges, Bristow
2nd Shirley Hatch, Claremore
3rd Mary Jo Deem, Tahlequah

CLASS C

1st Glenda Gower, Helena
2nd Bernice Schein, Yukon
3rd Janice MacDonald, Waynoka

Radio Speaking—Men

CLASS A

1st Fred Dorwart, Muskogee
2nd Paul Schwarts, Classen, Oklahoma City
3rd Jim Hanner, Sand Springs

CLASS B

1st Bill Lipe, Bristow
2nd Larry Ferguson, Commerce
3rd Ronnie Bryant, Tahlequah

CLASS C

1st Fenton Ramey, Yukon
2nd Gary Sims, Ft. Gibson
3rd Delbert King, Helena

Poetry Interpretation

CLASS A

1st Ladonna Miles, Sand Springs
2nd John Dean, Miami
3rd Sandra Sorells, Muskogee

CLASS B

1st Shirley Hatch, Claremore
2nd Bob Carey, Picher
3rd Vivian Aingworth, Tahlequah

CLASS C

1st Paula Sells, Helena
2nd Eileen Simpson, Covington
3rd James Thornton, Ft. Gibson

Dramatic Reading

CLASS A

1st Patsy Ayers, Muskogee
2nd Bob Patrick, Sand Springs
3rd Genell Overmyer

CLASS B

1st Carroll Thompson, Commerce
2nd Virginia Cox
3rd Irma Yost, Picher

CLASS C

1st Mary Lou Gilliland, Ft. Gibson
2nd Shelly Kline, Helena
3rd Dessa Copeland, Kiefer

Humorous Literature

1st Janice Willis, Sand Springs
2nd Sandra Sorrels, Muskogee
3rd Sally Williams, Miami

CLASS B

1st Ella Ostrom, Bristow
2nd Carl Smith, Commerce
3rd Terry Taylor, Claremore

CLASS C

1st Billy G. Hefner, Ft. Gibson
2nd Don Guy, Colbert
3rd Mary Lou Gilliland, Ft. Gibson

Public Address

CLASS A

1st Peggy Grossman, Muskogee
2nd Pat Colman, Sand Springs
3rd Jerry Juergens, Muskogee

CLASS B

1st Roberta Ogden, Jay
2nd Bob Carey, Picher
3rd Alfred Holland, Tahlequah

CLASS C

1st Carolyn Jo Parrish, Kiefer
2nd Bobby Bladd, Ft. Gibson
3rd Marianne Hedigar, Webbers Falls

Original Oratory

CLASS A

1st Diana Bankston, Muskogee
2nd Jim Hanner, Sand Springs
3rd Joe Schubert, Muskogee

CLASS B

1st Gene Henry, Picher
2nd Patricia Daniels, Hominy
3rd Lois Nelson, Jay

CLASS C

1st Bernice Schein, Yukon
2nd Steve Schnaithman, Covington
3rd Elizabeth Murphy, Hulbert

Extemp—Men

1st Charleston Hale, Ponca City
2nd Fred Willhoite, Classen, Oklahoma City
3rd Don Wills, Miami

CLASS B

1st Jimmie Flounoy, Tahlequah
2nd David Riggs, Picher
3rd Pete Byers, Wagoner

CLASS C

1st Joe Semrod, Yukon
2nd Alton Rivers, Webbers Falls
3rd Delbert King, Helena

Extemp—Girls

CLASS A

1st Genelle Overmyer, Muskogee
2nd Carol Lackey, Sand Springs
3rd Ann Sutton, Ponca City

CLASS B

1st Francis Walkenshaw, Picher
2nd Carol Ann Denny, Jay
3rd Myna Geurin, Wagoner

CLASS C

1st Kathlene Kelley, Yukon
2nd Norma Ruth Collier, Covington
3rd Sandra Meek, Waynoka

Discussion

CLASS A

Joe Schubert, Muskogee,

CLASS B

Superior
Jimmy Flournoy, Tahlequah,

CLASS C

Superior
Mary Beth Browning, Ft. Gibson,
Superior
Bernice Schein, Yukon,

Debate

CLASS A

1st Muskogee
2nd Classen, Oklahoma City
3rd Miami

CLASS B

1st Yukon
2nd Yaynoka
3rd Covington

WEST GEORGIA
INTERCOLLEGIATE SPEECH
TOURNAMENT
Carollton, Georgia
February 5-7
William H. Wroten, Jr., Director

Team Awards

AFFIRMATIVE:
1st—(tie)
Agnes Scott and Vanderbilt
2nd—
Emory University
3rd—
Berry College

NEGATIVE:
1st—(tie)
Vanderbilt, Agnes Scott, and Georgia Tech
2nd—
Emory University
3rd—
Mercer University

Individual Awards

AFFIRMATIVE:

1st—
William Baker—Vanderbilt University

2nd—
Wence Cerne—Emory University

3rd—
James Hale—Emory University
Fred Quinton—Georgia Tech
Paul Simms—North Georgia College

NEGATIVE:

1st—
Fred Kissling—Vanderbilt University

2nd—
Mindel Gardenhis—Vanderbilt University

3rd—
Joen Fagan—Agnes Scott
William Tate—Emory-at-Oxford
William Acree—Georgia Tech
Raymond Wood—Georgia Tech

EL GRAN CERTAMEN ORATORIO UNIVERSITARIO INTERNACIONAL

March 12-14, 1953

W. Arthur Cable, Director

Held at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona; and the Fray Marcos de Niza Hotel, Nogales, Sonora, Mexico.

Awards were presented for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place in ten different divisions. Winners of first place received cups; second place, medals; and third place, certificates of merit.

Debate, Class A, Upper Men:

1st—Don Wright and John Morrison, University of New Mexico.
2nd—Samuel N. Elpern and Richard Segal, University of Arizona.
3rd—Robert Ballard and Stephen Stewart, University of Nevada.

Debate, Class A, Lower Men:

1st—Jim Lare and Merrill Francis, Occidental College.
2nd—Charles Hedman and Scott Momaday, University of New Mexico.
3rd—Carl Esenwein and Felix Briones, University of New Mexico.

Debate, Class A, Women:

1st—Klonda Bowers and Sally Goodman, Arizona State College at Tempe.
2nd—Peggy Keller and Ann Frostig, Occidental College.
3rd—Sue Casey and Beverly Sue Hug, University of Nevada.

Debate, Class B:

1st—Richard Searls and Odetta Wold, Arizona State College at Tempe.
2nd—Ronald Burnett and Arland Brusuen, Moorhead State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minnesota.
3rd—Elbert Milburn and John Vogel, Moorhead State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minnesota.

Oratory—Men's Division:

1st—Fred Buehl, Arizona State College at Tempe.
2nd—Richard Segal, University of Arizona.
3rd—Joe Patton, Phoenix College (Phoenix, Arizona).

Oratory—Women's Division:

1st—Sally Goodman, Arozina State College at Tempe.
2nd—Kathleen Devine, University of Arizona.

Extemporaneous Speaking—Men's Division:

1st—John Morrison, University of New Mexico.
2nd—Bill Rodman, Occidental College.
3rd—RobertEllis, Arizona State College at Tempe.

Extemporaneous Speaking—Women's Division:

1st—Ann Frostig, Occidental College.
2nd—Peggy Keller, Occidental College.
3rd—Klonda Bowers, Arizona State College at Tempe.

After-Dinner Speaking—Men's Division:

1st—Samuel Elpern, University of Arizona.
2nd—Robert Ballard, University of Nevada.
3rd—Carl Esenwein, University of New Mexico.

After-Dinner Speaking—Women's Division:

1st—Peggy Keller, Occidental College. (Only one entrant in this event).

SOUTH ATLANTIC FORENSIC TOURNAMENT

March 5-7, 1953

Albert Keiser, Director

DEBATE

1st—George Washington University
2nd—Appalachian State Teachers College.
3rd—East Carolina College.

Men's Standard Oratory

John K. Smart, Jr., Lenoir Rhyne College; H. M. Marlowe, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute.

Women's Standard Oratory

Helen Nash, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute; Jeannine Fiori, Maryville College.

Men's Situation Oratory

Paul Conrad, Lenoir Rhyne College; Tom Hamilton, Catawba College.

Women's Situation Oratory

(Tie). Ruth Hamm, Lenoir Rhyne College; Helen Shuford, Lenoir Rhyne College.

Men's Extempore

Virgil Moorefield, Wake Forest College; Fred Brooks, Duke University.

Women's Extempore

Mary Faith Chastain, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute; Linda Loehler, George Washington University.

Men's After Dinner

Jim Greene, Wake Forest College; Lloyd Arrowwood, East Tennessee State College.

Women's After Dinner

Mary Ann Wolfe, Lenoir Rhyne College; Naomi Burgos, Maryville College.

Men's Impromptu

Joe Hough, Wake Forest College; H. M. Marlowe, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute.

Women's Impromptu

Janice Clodfelter, Lenoir Rhyne College; Lexy Broughton, University of South Carolina.

Radio Address Reading

James Milo, Duke University; Bill Taylor, East Tennessee State College.

Radio Poetry Reading

Linda Loehler, George Washington University; Joyce Stone, Carson-Newman College.

Men's Radio Extempore

James Robinson, George Washington University; Bruce O'Day, Duke University.

Women's Radio Extempore

Frances Motsinger, Lenoir Rhyne College; Jo Ann Hardin, Appalachian State Teachers College.

Address Reading

David Wright, Lenoir Rhyne College; Jim Greene, Wake Forest College.

Poetry Reading

Joan Link, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute; Jean Hopkins, Appalachian State Teachers College.

Men's Problem Solving

Lloyd Arrowwood, East Tennessee State College; Virgil Moorfield, Wake Forest College.

Women's Problem Solving

Jo Ann Aldridge, Appalachian State Teachers College; Helen Nash, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute.

Men's Newscast

David Wright, Lenoir Rhyne College; Virgil Moorfield, Wake Forest College.

Women's Newscast

Linda Loehler, George Washington University; Barbara Sachs, George Washington University.

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA
TOURNAMENT
Robert H. Wick, Director
Debate
1st—Mankato State Teachers.
2nd—St. Cloud Teachers.
Best Debater
Tom Palmersheim, St. Cloud Teachers
Best Discusser
David Jerde, State Teachers St. Cloud
Best Orators
Jeanette Gilmer, St. Cloud Teachers
Truman Wood, Mankato Teachers
Best Extemp Speaker
Duanne Lunneman, St. Cloud Teachers

LINFIELD TOURNAMENT
Roy Mahaffey, Director
Senior Sweepstakes
University of Oregon 16
Pacific Lutheran College . . 35
Linfield College 23
Willamette University . . . 22
Junior Sweepstakes
University of Utah 33
University of Portland . . . 18
Acting
MEN
First — Lee Paves, University of Portland.
Second — Robert Simons, University of Portland.
Second—David Case, University of Portland.
WOMEN
First—Pat Harper, Pacific University.
Second: Joan Du Gay, University of Portland.
Third — Margaret Conklin, Willamette.
Experimental
MEN
First—James Allen, Utah State.
Second — Frank Brodersen, Pacific University.
Third—Fred Williams, University of Idaho.
WOMEN
First—Ann Carr, University of California.
Second — Bonnie Turner, Brigham Young University.
Third—Shirley Bushing, Pacific Lutheran.
Oratory
SENIOR MEN
First—James Wood, Willamette.
Second—John Rydgren, Pacific Lutheran.
Third — William Caldwell, Chico State.
JUNIOR MEN
First—Elliott Aandahl, West Washington C. of E.
Second—Paul Ward, University of Oregon.
Third—Alfred Cave, Linfield.
SENIOR WOMEN
First—Joyce Gustafson, B. Y. U.
Second—Carol Nyholm, Wash. State.
Third—Sylvia Cmedley, University of Utah.
JUNIOR WOMEN
First—Lois Winterstein, Linfield.
Second—Janice Johnson, University of Utah.
Third—Marian Rutledge, Willamette.
After Dinner
SENIOR WOMEN
First—Inge Schmidt, Chico State.
Second—Mary Lou Fagerson, West. Washington C. of E.
Second—Pat Harper, Pacific Univ.
JUNIOR WOMEN
First—Bunny Reese, Univ. of Utah.
Second—Teddy McPhee, Linfield.
Third—Shirley Bushing, P. L. C.
SENIOR MEN
First—Paul Little, Linfield.
Second—Tom Barrett, Linfield.
Third—Bob Castell, Pacific Univ.
JUNIOR MEN
First—Tom Goldsmith, Lewis and Clark.
Second — Phil McLennan, Pacific University.
Third—Bob Irvin, Portland State.
Lincoln-Douglas
WOMEN
First—Virginia Patterson, Stanford.
Second—Twila Stritmatter, Linfield.
MEN
First—John Osburn, Pacific Lutheran.
First—Alan Hatlan, Pacific Lutheran.
Third—Ray Owens, Willamette.
Third—Fenton Hughes, Willamette.
Debate
SENIOR WOMEN
First — Kathy Doherty and Teres Lowney, Univ. of Montana.
Second — Edith Engel and Janet Klippen, P. L. C.
Second—Carol Nyholm and Frances Cresswell, W. S. C.
Second — Loretta Mason and Elsie Schiller, Univ. of Oregon.
Second—Colleen Taylor and Catherine Harper, Univ. of Utah.
JUNIOR WOMEN
First — Joyce Brim and Elizabeth Lenard, W. S. C.
Second—Marie Merrill and Roselyn Nebeker, Utah State.
Second—Marian Rutledge and Gay Kent, Willamette.
SENIOR MEN
First—John Judd and William Petersen, Idaho State.
Third — Kirby Brumfield, Oregon State.
JUNIOR MEN
First: William Brady, Oregon State.
Second—Bob Bennett, University of Utah.
Second—Karl Keller, University of Utah.
SENIOR WOMEN
First—Marlene Little, Oregon State.
Second—Colleen Taylor, University of Utah.
Third— Alpha Jane Clinkinbeard, Oregon State.
JUNIOR WOMEN
First — Carolyn Jensen, Brigham Young University.
Second — Geraldine Larson, Grays Harbor.
Third—Ruth Heino, Pacific Lutheran.
Interview
MEN
First — Elliott Aandahl, Western Wash. C. of E.
Second—Don Blanchard, Linfield.
Third — Walter Judd, Lewis and Clark.
Third—Neil Gygi, Univ. of Utah.
WOMEN
First—Barbara McDonald, Western Wash. C. of E.
Second—Colleen Taylor, University of Utah.
Third—Norma Jeanne Leistiko, University of Portland.
Third—Shauna McLatchy, University of Utah.
Extemp
SENIOR MEN
First—Chandler Myers, Stanford.
Second—John Judd, Idaho State.
Second—James Wood, Willamette.
JUNIOR MEN
First—Carey McWilliams, Univ. of California.
Second—Jerry Pulley, Univ. of Utah.
Second—John Jacobs, Pacific Univ.
Extemp
SENIOR WOMEN
First—Nancy Watson, Linfield.
Second—Joyce Gustafson, B. Y. U.
Second—Sylvia Smedley, Univ. of Utah.
JUNIOR WOMEN
First — Janice Johnson, Univ. of Utah.
Second — Virginia Patterson, Stanford.
Third—Lois Winterstein, Linfield.
Interpretation
SENIOR MEN
First—John Rydgren, Pacific Lutheran.
Second—Paul Little, Linfield.
Third — William Caldwell, Chico State.
JUNIOR MEN
First — David Case, Univ. of Portland.

Second— Robert Simons, Univ. of Portland.
Third—William Trevor, Lewis and Clark.
Third—Ben Jackson, Gonzaga.

SENIOR WOMEN

First—Mary Lou Fagerson, Western Wash. C. of E.
Second—Pat Harper, Pacific Univ.
Third—Inge Schmidt, Chino State.

JUNIOR WOMEN

First Jean Grosvenor, University of Portland.
Second—Joan Du Gay, University of Portland.
Third—Elizabeth Winship, Willamette.

Impromptu
SENIOR MEN

First—John Osburn, P. L. C.
Second—Alan Hatlan, P. L. C.
Second — Emil Pike, Washington State.
Second—Dick Donaldson and Hugh Hafer, St. Martins.
Third—Thomas Schiedel and James Wood, Willamette.

JUNIOR MEN

First—Bruce Holt and Paul Ward, University of Oregon.
Second — Bob Bennett and Frank Johnson, University of Utah.
Third—Dick Heiser and Jerry Pulley, University of Utah.
Third—Ned Lange and Fred Shields, Whitman.
Third—John Jacobs and Phil McLennan, Pacific Univ.

Congress
MEN

University of California: Stan Lynan, Cary McWilliams, Bill Sprague.
Oregon State: Gail Schoppert.
Stanford: David Jacobson.

WOMEN

Western Washington C. of E.: Barbara MacDonald, Mary Lou Fagerson.
P. L. C.: Janet Klippen.
Standford: Virginia Patterson.

Talent Show

First — Milicent Bulato and Luren Sakagawa, College of Puget Sound.
Second—Pat Harper, Pacific Univ.
Third—Jerry Jaeger, Gonzaga Univ.

EASTERN ILLINOIS VARSITY TOURNAMENT

February 7

1st—(tie), University of Illinois at Chicago and Illinois College.

PURDUE NOVICE TOURNAMENT

February 7

1st—Case Institute of Technology
2nd—University of Illinois at Chicago, Varsity

MISSOURI VALLEY FORENSIC ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

March 26, 27, 28, 1953

Schools: Creighton U., Iowa State College, Kansas State Colloge, U. of Colorado, U. of Kansas, U. of Nebraska, U. of Oklahoma, U. of South Dakota, U. of Texas.

EXTEMP SPEAKING

1st—Lee Baird, U. of Kansas.
2nd—Frank Mitchell, U. of Oklahoma.
3rd—Jack Rogers, U. of Nebraska.

ORATORY

1st—Jack Rogers, U. of Nebraska.
2nd—Frank Mitchell, U. of Oklahoma.
3rd—Lee Baird, U. of Kansas.

DEBATE

Resolved: That trade Restrictions among the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Should be Abolished.

1st—U. of Nebraska	10 W	2 L
2nd—Iowa State College	8 W	4 L
3rd—U. of Kansas U. of Oklahoma U. of South Dakota	7 W	5 L

SUPERIOR DEBATERS

Bill Crews, U. of Kansas.
Doris Carlson, U. of Nebraska.
Todd Willy, U. of South Dakota.
Earl Van Cerpen, U. of So. Dakota
Frank Mitchell, U. of Oklahoma.

IOWA FORENSIC ASSOCIATION TOURNAMENT
Luther, Iowa
Decorah, Iowa

March 13 and 14, 1953

NEW OFFICERS

President - - - Elizabeth White Simpson College
Vice-Pres. - - - - Gladys Kuehl Buena Vista College
Sec.-Treas. - - - Nicholos Cripe Grinnell College

AFTER DINNER SPEAKING

Excellent—Carroll Theobold (Loras)

EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

Women:

Superior—Dixie Loosemore (Drake)
Excellent — Patsy Shaffer (Upper Iowa)
Excellent—Anne Harris (Coe)
Excellent — Donna Fraser (Buena Vista)

Men

Superior—Roger Witke (Simpson)
Superior—Dave DeDoncker (St. Ambrose)
Superior—Bob Heerner (Cornell)
Superior — Richard Stanley (Iowa State)
Excellent — Glen VanLaninghan (Drake)
Excellent—James Madden (Coe)
Excellent—Warren Gasnik (Morningside)

ORATORY

Women

Excellent—Anita Flint (Luther)
Excellent—Doris Burkhart (Central)
Excellent — Tommy Stanley (Cornell)
Excellent—Mary Wood (Grinnell)
Excellent—Jean Moe (Buena Vista)

Men

Superior—Dick Urdahl (Luther)
Superior — Richard Clark (Upper Iowa)
Excellent—Jack Starr (Drake)

Interstate Winners

Jean Moe of Buena Vista; Richard Clark of Upper Iowa.

Alternates: Mary Wood, Grinnell; Dick Urdahl, Luther.

(The first two herewith represent Iowa in the Interstate Oratorical Contest.)

POETRY READING

Women

Superior—Dixie Loosemore (Drake)
Excellent — Geraldine Punt (Central)
Excellent—Marilyn Hull (Simpson)
Excellent—Irene Schultz (Luther)
Excellent—Jean Moe (Buena Vista)

Men

Excellent—Arlen Salthouse (Central)
Excellent—Carroll Theobold (Loras)

DISCUSSION

Superior—Jim Smith (Iowa State)
Superior—Dick Smith (Simpson)
Superior—Bill Fahan (Buena Vista)
Superior — Richard Clark (Upper Iowa).

DEBATE

Superior Teams

Hillesland and Hoven (Luther)
Stanley and Hyde (Iowa State)
Whittlesey and Smith (Iowa State)
Wood and Wood (Grinnell)

SUPERIOR DEBATERS

Alton Hillesland (Luther)
Bob Hoven (Luther)
Jerry Kline (Cornell)
Bob Hoerner (Cornell)
Anne Harris (Coe)
Alvin Poppen (Central)
Dave DeDoncker (St. Ambrose)
Howard Hyde (Iowa State)
Richard Stanley (Iowa State)
Jim Smith (Iowa State)
Jerry Whittlesey (Iowa State)
Bob Starrett (Grinnell)
Mary Wood (Grinnell)
Jean Wood (Grinnell)

DEBATE RESULTS

1st—Iowa State
2nd—Grinnell
3rd—Grinnell.

SECOND ANNUAL HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH FESTIVAL TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

March 20-21, 1953

Gordon F. Hostettler, Director

273 students from 36 high schools in Pennsylvania and New Jersey participated. Events included debate (national topic), discussions (How shall we deal with communism in the United States?), Extempore Speaking (The United States in World Affairs), Public Speaking, Radio speaking, Poetry Reading, and Dramatic Reading. Participants in each event were rated rather than being ranked. Blair Academy, Blairstown, New Jersey, won the Speech Trophy by earning the most points based on calculations including all events. This was the second consecutive year in which Blair was awarded the Trophy.

A highlight of the Festival was the University Theatre's production of DARKNESS AT NOON which was attended by the students who participated in the Festival.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY INVITATIONAL COLLEGE FORENSIC TOURNAMENT

Waco, Texas

February 6 and 7, 1953

Glenn R. Capp, Director

INFORMATION REGARDING CONTESTS

A championship tournament in debate, oratory, and extemporaneous speaking.

In all contests there were four divisions—upper men's divisions, upper women's divisions, lower men's divisions, lower women's dvision.

Separate divisions for men and women.

(a). The National Debate Topic on F. E. P. C.

(b). Current topics for extemporaneous speaking.

(c). No limit on choice in oratory.

The results were as follows:

31 colleges and universities from five states entered 98 debate teams, 97 extemporaneous speakers, and 63 orators in the annual Baylor Forensic Tournament. This is the 17th annual Baylor Tournament under the direction of Professor Glenn R. Capp, Chairman of Speech Department. Contests were held in debate, oratory, and extemporaneous speaking for four divisions. The results of this year's meeting are as follows:

ORATORY

Senior Men:

1st—Bill Brice, Southern Methodist University.
2nd—Tom Hall, Louisiana College.
3rd—Lester Robbins, Baylor University.

Junior Men

1st—Joe Cannon, North Texas State.
2nd—Bernie Burrus, University of Houston.
3rd—Charles Stagg, Louisiana College.

Senior Women

1st — Phyllis Bunker, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.
2nd — Jo Ann Durham, Louisiana Tech.
3rd — Peggy Robinson, Louisiana Tech.

Junior Women

1st — Alice McCrary, Mary Hardin-Baylor.
2nd—Pat Thebedraux, University of Houston.
3rd—Beth Dubus, Southwest Louisiana Institute.

EXTEMPORANEOLS SPEAKING

Senior Men

1st—Tom Hall, Louisiana College.
2nd — Bill Kilgarlin, University of Houston.
3rd—John Bagalay, Baylor.
Bill Brice, Southern Methodist University.

Junior Men

1st—Tie: Ky Ewing, Baylor; John Morrison, University of New Mexico.
2nd—Charles Stagg, Louisiana College.
3rd—Chester Newland, North Texas State.

Senior Women

1st — Dolores Kosberg, Southern Methodist University.
2nd — Peggy Robinson, Louisiana Tech.
3rd—Tie: Phyllis Bunker, Southwestern, Kansas; Billie Walker, University of Houston; Joe Ann Huffman, Southwestern Kansas.

Junior Women

1st—Sherry McGauhey, Baylor.
2nd—Beth Dubus, Southwest Louisiana Institute.
3rd—Tie: Ann Barnett, Southern Methodist University; Jane Seeley, Southeastern State, Okla.

DEBATE

Senior Men's

1st—Southern Methodist University
Bill Brice
Jim Whittelay
2nd—Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas.
Jim Cash
Eddie Smith

Junior Men's

1st—Baylor University, Waco, Texas
Donald Howell
Ky Ewing
2nd—University of New Mexico
John Morrison
Don Wright

Senior Women's

1st — Southwestern College, Winfield, Kansas.
Phyllis Bunker
Wanda Smith
2nd—Louisiana College, Pineville, Louisiana.
Pat Brister
Allene Shirley

Junior Women's

1st—Baylor University, Waco, Texas
Sydney Billingsley
Sherry McGauhey
2nd—Texas A. and I. College, Kingsville, Texas.
Carol Alsup
Ann Garner.

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY-WACO HIGH SCHOOL INVITATIONAL SPEECH TOURNAMENT

February 20 and 21, 1953

Glenn R. Capp, Director

INFORMATION REGARDING CONTESTS

1. Jointly sponsored by Baylor University and Waco High School for High Schools only.
2. No upper and lower divisions.
3. Separate divisions for boys and girls.
4. The national topic of "A World Government by the Atlantic Pact Nations". This was used for debate. Current topics were used for extemporaneous speaking. Students had their choice in all of our other contests.
5. The winners were as follows:

BOYS' DEBATE

1st—Waco High School
James Sewell
Jerry Clemmons
2nd—Mimami High School, Miami, Oklahoma.
John Dean
Don Willis

GIRLS' DEBATE

1st—Adamson High School, Dallas, Texas.
Johnnie Stone
Carol Smith
2nd—Muskogee High School, Muskogee, Oklahoma.
Diana Bankston
Genell Overmyer

SWEEPSTAKES

Tie—Waco High School and San Jacinto High School of Houston.
2nd—Muskogee High School.
3rd—Miami High School.

ILLINOIS INTERCOLLEGIATE ORATORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Illinois Intercollegiate Oratorical Association held its annual contests and business meeting on the Eastern Illinois State College campus in Charleston, Illinois, February 20 and 21. Contestants were entered in Men's Oratory, Women's Oratory, Men's extemporaneous speaking, and Women's extemporaneous speaking from Monmouth College, Augustana College, Wheaton College, Northern Illinois State Teachers College, Southern Illinois University, Illinois College, Illinois State Normal University, Bradley University, and Eastern Illinois State College.

Miss Gloria Lewis, of Illinois State Normal University placed first in Women's oratory, with a speech entitled "Each on His Own Merits." Mr. David Swanson, of Augustana College, was first in Men's oratory. The title of his oration was "Down with America!" Each of these winners was awarded a gold medal and the opportunity to represent Illinois in the Interstate Oratorical Association competition, April 15 and 16 at Northwestern University. Second place silver medal winners in oratory were Barbara Conover, Augustana, and Edward Carpenter, of Illinois Normal. The bronzemedals for third place went to Barbara Kott of Wheaton College and James Skipper of Northern.

In extemporaneous speaking, Miss Patricia Schofield, Northern, and William Boege of Bradley University were awarded the gold medals. Marjorie Johnson of Normal and Charles McNamer of Northern shared second place. Chris Nystrom of Wheaton was joined in the third place bracket with Jack Parker of Normal.

Officers for the association this year were Prof. Robert Martin, Lake Forest, president; Prof. Glenn E. Reddick, North Central, vice-president; Prof. H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Eastern, treasurer and tournament manager; and Adaline Dougherty, secretary. Miss Dougherty is the president of the Illinois Sigma Chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, at Eastern.

NORTHWESTERN TOURNAMENT
February 14

1st—St. Olaf
2nd (tie)—Augustana, Bradley, and Grinnell
Junior Division—1st—Notre Dame; 2nd—Calvin and Wisconsin

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE TOURNAMENT
February 5, 6, 7, 1953
Donald Sprague, Director

AFFIRMATIVE

	W.	L.	Pts.
Miami	9	0	1195
Wake Forest	8	1	1105
Notre Dame	8	1	1060
Florida State	7	2	930
Florida	6	3	800
Army (West Point)	6	3	790
Fla. Christian	5	4	720
Texas	5	4	695
Navy	3	6	510
Georgia	1	8	225

NEGATIVE

	W.	L.	Pts.
Florida	5	4	695
Notre Dame	5	4	655
Texas	4	5	590
Miami	4	5	570
Army	3	6	475
Florida State	3	6	445
Georgia	3	6	380
Wake Forest	2	7	355
Fla. Christian	2	7	335
Navy (Annapolis)	1	8	170

FINALS

Miami affirmative defeated Florida negative by unanimous decision of the judges.

MISSOURI ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE DEBATE DIRECTORS
February 26, 27, 28, 1953
Gilbert Rau, Director

After Dinner Speaking
Excellent—Miguel Taitano, Central.

Selected Poetry
Superior—Richard Harriman, Wm. Jewell; Mary Lou Riggs, Wm. Jewell.
Excellent—Joan Fagan, Warrensburg; Mary June Bierbeck.

Extemporaneous Speaking
SENIOR COLLEGE
Superior—George Dooley, Wm. Jewell; Bob Drury, Wm. Jewell; Dennis Semkin, Central.
Excellent—Karl Pieper, Westminster.
JUNIOR COLLEGE
Superior—Ed Gaul, Wm. Jewell; John Strecker, Drury.
Excellent—Don Browning, Central; James Forbes, Warrensburg; Jim Rila, Mo. Valley; Rodney Scheer, St. Pauls.

Discussion
Superior—Bob Schnucker, Kirksville; Ted Smith, Central.
Excellent—Clarence Finley, Wm. Jewell; Jim Rila, Mo. Valley; Paul Williams, Central.

Original Poetry
Superior—Richard Harriman, Wm. Jewell.
Excellent — Charles Kusewelle, Westminster.

Original Oratory.
SENIOR COLLEGE
Superior — John Stecker, Drury (State representative to Old Line Oratory).
Excellent—Geo. Dooley, Wm. Jewell; Robt. Drury, Wm. Jewell; Miguel Taitano, Central; Sherma Mawson, Warrensburg (State representative).
JUNIOR COLLEGE
Excellent—Donna Sheridan, Warrensburg; Neil Maupin, Mo. Valley; Don Browning, Central.

Debate
SENIOR COLLEGE
Superior—Cape Girardeau, Rockhurst, Warrensburg, William Jewell.
JUNIOR COLLEGE
Superior—Drury, St. Paul's William Jewell.

INTERCOLLEGIATE CONFERENCE ON WORLD PROBLEMS
State University of Iowa
March 6-7, 1953

SUPERIOR EXTEMPORE SPEAKER
Richard Stanley, Iowa State College (4.7).
EXCELLENT EXTEMPORE SPEAKERS
George Dooley, William Jewell (4.3); Roger Witke, Simpson (4.3); Bob Hoerner, Cornell (4.0).
SUPERIOR PUBLIC SPEAKER
Paul Rickman, Wheaton (5.0).
EXCELLENT PUBLIC SPEAKERS
James Hedges, St. Ambrose (4.3); Milt Brown, Iowa University (4.3); George Dooley, William Jewell (4.3).
SUPERIOR CHAIRMAN
Milt Brown, (4.7); Nort Mezvinsky, (4.7).
SUPERIOR DISCUSSANTS
Jim Briggs, DePauw, (4.8); Jack Parker, Illinois State Normal, (4.8).
SUPERIOR DEBATE TEAMS
Grinnell Neg., (4.8); Coe Neg., (4.7); DePauw Aff., (4.5).
SUPERIOR DEBATERS
Lavon Burrichter, Iowa State Teachers (5.0); Jean Wood, Grinnell (4.8); James Madden, Coe (4.7); Mary Wood, Grinnell (4.5); Dee Cain, Grinnell (4.5); Bob Hoerner, Cornell (4.5); Jerry Kline, Cornell (4.5).

DePAUW UNIVERSITY VARSITY TOURNAMENT
February 21

1st—DePauw; 2nd—Purdue

CHERRY BLOSSOM DEBATE TOURNAMENT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

March 19-21, 1953

Rev. Eugene Gallagher, S. J.
Mr. Jesse Mann, Directors

Type of contest: Debate only, for an affirmative and a negative team from each school, 7 rounds. Top affirmative team, and top negative team compete in formal final, before audience, and distinguished judges.

The subject used: the national debate topic for colleges (this year FEP).

WINNERS

George Washington University (Negative) of Washington, D. C., defeated University of Pennsylvania (Affirmative) in the formal debate at the end of the tournament.

This was the fifth annual Cherry Blossom Contest. Winners in former years, Florida (Univ. of); Army, Princeton, Princeton, (George Washington). Third-time winners retire the trophy.

The Cherry Blossoms of the tidal basin obliged by making their appearance in three glorious sunny days during the tournament. There are two rounds Thursday; a banquet Thursday night; Friday morning is left free for sightseeing with debates Friday beginning at 3:00 p. m. (2 rounds Friday). Saturday debates are at 10:30-1-and 3. Final at 7:30 p.m. Saturday. (Friday night a dance is held for the guests on the campus).

President Eisenhower **viva voce** declared his serious intentions to try to put in an appearance to talk to the debaters. Finally, when he decided he couldn't make it, he sent the following letter to be read to the debaters:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington
March 21, 1953.

Dear Reverend Gallagher:

I regret very much my being unable to be with you today as I have the highest regard for the aims of the Cherry Blossom Debating Tournament which is sponsored by your great University. I congratulate you on your sponsorship of the tournament and all the participants who have come so far to Washington to take part.

Sincerely,
(signed) Dwight D. Eisenhower

Reverend Eugene Gallagher, S. J.
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

REGION V TOURNAMENT

February 27-28

(Qualifying for West Point)

1st—(tie)—Augustana and Case; 3rd (tie)—University of Illinois at Chicago, Michigan State, and Notre Dame.

NORTHWEST TOURNAMENT AT ST. THOMAS

March 5-7

1st—Kansas; 2nd, Bradley

NOTRE DAME VARSITY TOURNAMENT

March 20-21

1st—Dartmouth; 2nd, Bradley

ILLINOIS STATE TOURNAMENT

(Men)—March 27-28

1st—(tie)—Wheaton, Bradley, and North Central; 4th—University of Illinois at Urbana.

(Women)

1st—Bradley; 2nd—Wheaton

PANEL OF AMERICANS

(Continued from Page 35)

ington, through the efforts of the Department of Speech, with the aid of Marian Hargrave, field representative from the University Religious Conference. The Panel gathered its support, financial and moral, from various civic organizations in and around Seattle. Operating on a budget provided by the contributions of its civic sponsors, during the first two years of its existence, the Panel made a total of 101 appearances before an estimated audience of 19,000 persons. Engagements were made before high school assemblies, college classes, church groups, service clubs, chambers of commerce and radio audiences in cities throughout the Pacific Northwest and British Columbia. During this period, panel members represented many cultures including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Indian, Negro, Filipino, Caucasian, and many religious beliefs including Christian, Jewish, Moslem, and Buddhist. Certain panel members professed adherence to no particular faith. Such, then, has been the history of the Panel of Americans at the University of Washington.

As regards its administrative procedures, the University of Washington Panel of Americans is unique. The uniqueness consists of a combination of instructional and community service aspects. Members of the Panel have the choice of participating in the activity with or without academic credit. Whatever the choice, the requirements for preparation and presentation remain the same. Officially, designated as part of a laboratory or workshop course in public discussion, the Panel has the advantage of regularly scheduled class meetings, and faculty time allowance for instruction and supervision. Unofficially designated as a community service activity, the Panel has the added advantage of community interest and support in the form of organizations such as the Urban League, Chamber of Commerce, and others. Such services include tours of community problem areas, surveys of successful project districts, and guest lecturers who, as professional social workers and religious directors, present facts drawn from immediate community experience.

The uniqueness of the Universtiy of Washington Panel of Americans is also noted in both aspects of its method—preparation and presentation. The first quarter of every school year is set aside for research, discussion, study, and over-all preparation. Beginning with the second quarter of the school year, the Panel appears before various community audiences, constantly carrying on its study and investigation of the subject matter. In the early stage of preparation each student is required to investigate the various materials and bibliographies with the aim of discovering what is the true nature of the problem, what are the causes of the problem. and what criteria would best guide the choice of solution. This preliminary analysis is followed by several periods of intensive group discussion which the students use as a sounding board for their individual conclusions. After re-evaluating their analyses, the students prepare individual talks outlining the original investigatory phase. In other words. students employ the problem-solving sequence in their original investigation, and then organize their talks by using the same sequence. Each student, then, prepares a talk which analyzes the problem of racial and religious intolerance as it exists in America generally, and in the Northwest specifically. Following this stage of analysis. students prepare individual solutions based upon their analyses, and shaped by their own attitudes, beliefs, and practices as members of particular cultures and adherents of particular religious beliefs. As with the analyses, panel members present their so-

lutions to the group for criticisms, questions, and comments. Finally, the student prepares a talk in which he explains his solution and indicates how and to what extent he thinks it will solve the problem of racial and religious intolerance. It will be noted that the student is asked to prepare two talks: an analysis and a solution. It is during this stage of preparation that the guest speakers are brought in to aid the students in their work; these speakers — rabbis, ministers, school superintendents, professional social workers, law enforcement officers and others—help to keep the group informed on current problems, practices, and ideals.

As regards the presentation, a typical University of Washington Panel of Americans program follows the pattern of an ordered symposium-forum. The first student speaker presents an analysis of the problem as objectively as possible. The following speakers, generally two in number, present what they consider to be the best solutions to the problem. When the students, working as a team, have presented their points of view, the audience is given an opportunity to direct questions to members of the Panel. The average program runs approximately 35-40 minutes.

Thus, the Panel of Americans, as conducted at the University of Washington, boasts a common heritage with other panel groups scattered throughout the land, but maintains a uniqueness exemplified by its method and its purpose. It is understood that the original Panel of Americans at UCLA consisted of a symposium of speakers each of whom presented his individual point of view more or less independently of his colleagues. The emphasis was on a warm, personal approach. Here at the University of Washington, we have been experimenting with a combination of problem-solving and symposium techniques which seems to have value both for training the student participants and influencing the community. The emphasis is upon a thoughtful, rational method because of the obvious lack of such approaches in some areas of social conflict. The problem-solving method, however, in the form of the individual, personalized solutions also makes use of a personal, "emotional" appeal. The purpose of the Panel is to bring about an effective integration of reason and feeling, thought and action on problems of race and religion in both student speakers and participating audiences. The Panel strives for and exemplifies cooperation, intensive preparation, and reasoned appeal — by members of different races and religions. The Panel strives to encourage thinking and active participation in group efforts designed to reduce social prejudices. It strives to contribute to a more abundant individual and social life.

Classified Table of Contents

Volumes 2 - 8

CLASSIFIED TABLE OF CONTENTS
On Academic and Non-Academic Debate

DEBATE PAYS DIVIDENDS—American Institute of Banking, Austin J. Freely, 1951, V. 7, No. 3, P. 93.

DEBATE IN A DEMOCRACY—E. R. Nichols, 1951, V. 7, No. 4, P. 107.

SPEECH ACTIVITIES TALKS ABOUT ITSELF, 1951, V. 7, No. 4, P. 134.

BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF DEBATE—E. C. Buehler, 1950, V. 6, No. 1, P. 3.

AS DEBATERS SEE IT—Edna G. Allen and Glenn R. Capp, 1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 151.

DEBATING AS IT LOOKS FROM HERE—Roy Wilkinson, Jr., 1948, V. 4, No. 2, P. 62.

A MODERN FORENSICS PROGRAM—L. D. Hanks, 1948, V. 4, No. 2, P. 68.

IT'S NOT DEBATABLE—Francis T. Feris, 1948, V. 4, No. 2, P. 71.

POPULARIZING DEBATING IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS, Ralph N. Schmidt, 1948, V. 4, No. 3, P. 107.

ENEMIES OF DEBATE—P. E. Lull, 1948, V. 4, No. 3, P. 108.

TOWARD BETTER DEBATING IN OUR COLLEGES—Herbert Rahe, 1948, V. 4, No. 3, P. 110.

WHY NOT OWN A COMPLETE FORENSIC LIBRARY?

Your library or forensic activity can now own an extensive collection of materials on debate, oratory, extemporaneous speaking, and discussion at an unbelievably low price. SPEECH ACTIVITIES is now making available back numbers (vols. 2-8) in combination with your subscription for 1953 for only $19.95. When you send in your renewal, let us know if you would like the back numbers included.

We present in this issue a classified list of the articles appearing in SPEECH ACTIVITIES (vols 2-8).

WORST FAULTS OF DEBATERS & JUDGES NAILED, 1948, V. 4, No. 3, P. 111.

IS IT REALLY FUTILE?—Mrs. Jack Lockwood, 1948, V. 4, No. 4, P. 174.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN COLLEGIATE DEBATING, 1747 - 1948—David Potter, 1948, V. 4, No. 4, P. 198.

DEBATE AND DISCUSSION — RIVALS OR ALLIES—Carroll P. Lahman, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 3.

FORENSIC PREPARATION IN ACTION—W. A. Dahlberg, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 6.

FORENSIC ACTION IN PREPARATION — ANSWER, Wade Ruby, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 15.

THE DOCTOR'S PLACE IN THE FEDERAL MEDICAL CARE PLAN—E. R. Nichols, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 15.

MORE ON LABOR IN MANAGEMENT—E. R. Nichols, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 23.

GLIMPSES OF EXTRA - CURRICULAR DEBATING, 1722-1783—David Potter, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 32.

WHAT IS MY DUTY?—Wilfred Myers, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 45.

SELECTING THE 1947-48 DEBATE TOPIC—P. E. Lull, 1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 75.

DO DEBATERS MAKE YOUR SQUAD OR DOES YOUR SQUAD MAKE DEBATERS?—Roy D. Murphy, 1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 76.

THE HIGH SCHOOL DEBATER CHOOSES HIS COLLEGE — E. R. Nichols, 1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 80.

THE DRURY PLAN OF DEBATE—Herbert Hackett, 1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 100.

VOICE AS A FACTOR IN FORENSICS—E. C. Buehler, 1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 111.

LET'S HAVE A STUDENT UNITED NATIONS NO. 1—Fred G. Alexander, 1947, V. 3. No. 3, P. 139.

DEBATING IMPROVES SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT—Carl Allen Pitt, 1947, V. 3, No. 3, P. 43.

SOME IMMEDIATE RETURNS TO THE DEBATER — Ralph Hutton, 1947, V. 3, No. 3, P. 160.

LET'S HAVE A STUDENT UNITED NATIONS NO. 2 — W. S. Howell, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 181.

LET'S NOT DEBATE — Willis F. Dunbar, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 193.

LET DEBATE GO ON — Vernon E. Beckman, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 195.

WHAT DO YOU MEAN — NO DEBATE?—E. R. Nichols, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 197.

DEBATE BRINGS BOOK CHARACTERS TO LIFE—C. A. Bristow, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 205.

ANNUAL COLLEGE QUESTION — E. R. Nichols, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 206.

OLD PRINCETON DEBATING SOCIETIES—David Potter, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 208.

COACHING NON-ACADEMIC DEBATES, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 215.

THE POINT OF VIEW—E. R. Nichols, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 217.

DEBATE TAKES THE AIR—1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 221.

SPEECH IN THE EXTRA-CURRICULUM PROGRAM—Arthur E. Secord and Ruth H. Thomas, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 5.

PUBLIC ADDRESS — W. Norwood Brigance, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 9.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH DEBATE QUESTIONS?—Robert T. Oliver, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 12.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE — CLUE TO WORLD PEACE—Bernard L. Hyink, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 29.

"FREE TRADE" FALLACY—Arthur Besse, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 29.

WHAT ABOUT THE FREE TRADE QUESTION?—E. R. Nichols, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 33.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE COMPULSORY MILITARY SITUATION —1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 37.

TWENTY-FOUR YEARS OF PI KAPPA DELTA RECORDS—E. R. Nichols, 1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 47.

PEACE TIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION—1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 52.

PHI RHO PI RESUMES ITS PLACE IN FORENSICS—1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 59.

SOCIAL REHABILITATION THROUGH DEBATE — Austin J. Freely, 1946, V. 2. No. 1, P. 60.

SPEECH IN OUR MODERN WORLD —Karl Mundt, 1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 77.

DEBATE IN A COLLEGE OF THE FUTURE—James N. Holm, 1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 79.

TEN COMMANDMENTS OF THE DEBATER—E. C. Buehler, 1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 82.

DEMOCRACY THRIVES ON DEBATE—Lionel Crocker, 1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 83.

CHOOSING THE DEBATE QUESTION—1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 99.

DISCUSSION, PUBLIC SPEAKING, AND DEBATING — Kenneth G. Hance, 1946, V. 2. No. 3, P. 139.

SELECTING THE DEBATE QUESTION—Forrest H. Rose, 1946, V. 2, No. 3, P. 151.

DEFINING THE PROPOSITION — Hugo E. Hellman, 1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 165.

BASIC CASE POSSIBILITIES IN A QUESTION OF POLICY—George M. Musgrove, 1946, V. 2, No. 3, P. 193.

HERE ARE THE ANSWERS, George M. Musgrove, 1946. V. 3. No. 195.

THE PUBLIC FORUM, H. Dana Hopkins, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 209.

DISCUSSION DEBATE: DICHOTOMY OR CONTINUUM—Robert D. Clark, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 213.

DEBATING FROM ARISTOTLE TO ATOMS—Hale Aarnes, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P.

WELLS-O'NEILL CONTROVERSY—George M. Musgrave, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 218.

COMMENT ON BETZ EVALUATION OF INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSIC PROGRAM—Barbara Merrill, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 221.

BUILDING YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE CASE—Hugo E. Hellman, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 235.

American Forensic Association

AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION CONSTITUTION — 1950, V. 6, No. 1, P. 11.

AMERICAN FORENSIC LEAGUE NOTES—1950, V. 6. No. 2. P. 71.

AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION NOTES—1950, V. 6, No. 3, P. 137.

PROPOSED NEW ASSOCIATION OF SPEECH DIRECTORS, LETTERS OF SPEECH DIRECTORS—1949, V. 5, No. 1, P. 38.

Attack on Debating

WHY CONTESTS IN MUSIC, SPEECH AND ARTS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED—Lowell B. Fisher, 1951, V. 7, No. 1, P. 8.

I SPEAK FOR THE N.C.A. CONTEST COMMITTEE—P. E. Lull, 1951, V. 7, No. 1, P. 10.

MINNESOTA REPLY TO THE NCA COMMITTEE REPORT—1951, V. 7, No. 1, P. 12.

PRESIDENT BUEHLER OF DELTA SIGMA RHO COMMENTS ON NCA AFFAIR—1951, V. 7, No. 1, P. 14.

WHAT DEANS SAY ABOUT ACTIVITIES IN SPEECH—Elbert W. Harrington, 1951, V. 7, No. 2, P. 55.

ON THE NORTH CENTRAL FRONT —1951, V. 7, No. 2. P. 57.

HOW IT CAME OUT IN THE END—1951, V. 7, No. 3, P. 80.

A PROGRAM OF SPEECH EDUCATION S. A. A. STATEMENT—1951, V. 7, No. 3, P. 86.

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION STIRS THE WITCHES BREW — 1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 145.

REPLY TO NORTH CENTRAL COMMITTEE—1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 147.

NCA DRAWS FIRE FROM AFA — 1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 148.

Audiences

THE DEBATER AND HIS AUDIENCE—Edd Miller, 1949, V. 5, No. 4, P. 157.

Character Building Or Educational Value of Debate.

A REBUTTAL THAT TOOK THIRTY YEARS TO DEVELOP — Brooks Quimby, 1952, V. 8, No. 2, P. 35.

COLLEGE DEBATE — GOOD OR EVIL? — Francis E. Cronin, 1952, V. 2, No. 2, P. 59.

College and High School Orations

AFTER FOUR YEARS — William Maxwell, 1952, V. 8, No. 2, P. 44.

THE NEWER SOUTH—Lenore Loving, 1952, V. 8, No. 3, P. 93.

HITHERTO SHALT THOU COME—BUT NO FURTHER! — Dean R. Pic'l, 1951, V. 7, No. 1, P. 16.

ALL THAT GLITTERS — Bill Caldwell, 1951, V. 7, No .2, P. 47.

A NATION'S PROMISE—Frank Dale 1951, V. 7, No. 4, P. 114.

THE CARPENTER'S DREAM—David Levering, 1950, V. 6, No. 1, P. 18.

MARRIAGE—Roberta Evans, 1950, V. 6, No. 2, P. 62.

JAMES MADISON AND THE AMERICAN IDEAL—Walter McSherry, 1950, V. 6, No. 3, P. 124.

JUKE BOX DEMOCRACY — Inge Schmidt, 1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 154.

A YEAR GOES BY—Omar Kureishi, 1949, V. 5, No. 1, P. 17.

THE TIME HAS COME—David Levering, 1949, V. 5, No. 2, P. 78.

MY PAPER DOLL — John W. Low, 1949, V. 5, No 4, P. 164.

DEPT. OF COLLEGE ORATORY—WEEP NO MORE MY LADY—Bob Parkins. 1948, V. 4, No. 1, P. 20.

ILL FARES THE LAND—Loren Carlson, 1948, V. 4, No. 2, P. 76.

TIME AND CHANGE — Dorothy Flemming, 1948, V. 4, No. 4, P. 180.
THE PROMISED LAND—Joe Ikeguchi, 1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 50.
TOP RANKING ORATIONS AT BOWLING GREEN. 1—PEACE OR PIECES. 2 — DEPRESSION PROFESSION — Georgianne Johnson, 1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 120.
THE CENTER POLE—Harold Brack, 1947, V. 3, No. 3, 165.
DRAZA MIHAILOVICH — Yvonne Battin, 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 204.
MODERN MIDAS—Ray Unterwiner, 1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 91.
ON GETTING ALONG WITH RUSSIANS—Bob Underhill, 1946, V. 2, No. 3, P. 181.
WASHINGTON—Albert Mann, 1947, V. 2, No. 4, P. 250.
SHYLOCK—Roy C. McCall, 1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 244.

Colleges Presented in Write-up and Pictures

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO—1952, V. 8, No. 1, P. 15.
DENISON UNIVERSITY (Ohio), 1952 V. 8, No. 2, P. 47.
WHEATON COLLEGE (Ill.) — 1952, V. 8, No. 3, P. 78.
WHITTIER COLLEGE (Calif.)—1952 V. 8, No. 4, P. 107.
BOSTON UNIVERSITY (Mass). 1951, V. 7, No. 1, P. 20.
OTTAWA UNIVERSITY (Kans.) 1951, V. 7, No. 2, P. 51.
WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE—1951, V. 7, No. 4, P. 119.
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS (Calif.)—1950, V. 6, No. 1, P. 23.
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY — 1950, V. 6, No. 2, P. 72.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY — 1950, V. 6, No. 3, P. 119.
PASADENA CITY COLLEGE (Calif.) —1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 161.
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA — 1949, V. 5, No. 1, P. 23.
BRADLEY UNIVERSITY (Ill.)—1949. V. 5, No. 2, P. 71.
PEPPERDINE COLLEGE (Calif.)—1949, V. 5, No. 3, P. 119.
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO — 1948, No. 2, P. 77.
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—1948, V. 4, No. 3, P. 126.
OREGON UNIVERSITY—1948, V. 4, No. 4, P. 185.
BOWLING GREEN UNIVERSITY (Ohio)—1947, V. 3, No. 1, P. 34.
SOUTHWEST LOUISIANA INSTITUTE—1947, V. 3, No. 2, P. 101.
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY (N. J. — 1947, V. 3, No. 4, P. 210.
SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGE—1947, V. 3, No. 3.
BATES COLLEGE (Me.)—1946, V. 2, No. 1, P. 18.
OTTAWA UNIVERSITY (Kans.) —1946, V. 2, No. 2, P. 104.
MANCHESTER COLLEGE (Ind.) —1946, V. 2, No. 3, P. -76.
LINFIELD COLLEGE (Ore.)—1946, V. 2, No. 4, P. 238.

Communication Skills

THE COMMUNICATION SKILLS — Herbert Hackett, 1952, V. 8, No. 2, P. 39.

Debates In Print

CONSCRIPTION FOR ESSENTIAL SERVICE—1951, V. 7, No. 3, P. 97.
LIBERTY IS THREATENED BY THE WELFARE STATE—International Debate — Ohio State vs. British Team—1950, V. 6, No. 3, P. 105.
NON-COMMUNIST NATIONS SHOULD FORM A NEW INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION — 1950, V. 6, No. 4, P. 173.
ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT BY DIRECT VOTE OF THE PEOPLE —1949, V. 5, No. 3, P. 108.
NATIONALIZATION OF BASIC INDUSTRIES—1949, V. 5, No. 4, P. 169.

TO BE CONTINUED IN THE AUTUMN ISSUE

CONTEST DISCUSSION

(Continued from Page 37)

HOW WILL THE PARTICIPANT'S BRIEF PERIOD OF CHAIRMANSHIP FIGURE IN HIS EVALUATION BY THE JUDGE?

The judge should have before him a rating sheet for members which would yet allow him to give a participant credit for a good job (while chairman) of focusing the group, which is the essential duty, it seems, of the leader. If the judge is to rate the participants, for instance, on the four items listed below, he should have little difficulty in finding a place for any comment he wishes to make on the chairmanship period.

Worth of Information Presented
Worth of Thinking Done in the Group
Contribution to Effective Group Atmosphere
Contribution to Progress Toward Group Goal

It seems that any focusing done would contribute either to "group atmosphere" or to "progress toward group goal."

Conclusion

The Round-Rotating Chairmanship seems to be a more effective means of providing leadership in contest discussion than any of the other methods examined. Its superiority lies in its consistency with principles of good discussion and in its provision of a valid basis for measuring participation in tournament discussion.

EDITOR IN JAPAN

(Continued from Page 42)

of sex, institutional loyalty, or merely human consideration. It is a successful relationship when it is one of mutual regard, respect, and loyalty to one another. This is the indescribable essence of teaching, the thing that makes education one of the noble experiences of life.

Direct Election of The President

NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL SUBJECT

1953-1954

Speech Activities

HAS AVAILABLE A LIMITED NUMBER OF THE FOLLOWING

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT BY DIRECT VOTE OF THE PEOPLE — A DEBATE — SPEECH ACTIVITIES, VOL 5, NO. 3— $1.50.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT — HANDBOOK FOR THE DEBATE SEASON OF 1949-50 — $3.50.